A Friendly Conference BETWEEN A Paulist and a Galatian, In DEFENCE of the Apostolical Doctrine OF JUSTIFICATION by FAITH without Works; Against many Specious Exceptions of the Modern *GALATIANS*: WHEREIN The Question, whether the Gospel be a New Law is modestly Discussed and Determined in the Negative.

By *THOMAS DANSON*, Minister of the Gospel, sometime Fellow of *Magd.* Coll. *Oxon.*

——*Valde sibi acuti videntur Papistæ quum allegant Operibus se Nihil tribuere, nisi mediante Christi gratiâ. Quasi verò alius fuerit Galatarum Error. Neque enim à Christo deficere se credebant, aut renuntiare ejus gratiæ*, Calv. in Galat. 5. 2.

London: Printed for *Samuel Crouch*, over against the *Royal Exchange*, in *Cornhil.* 1694.

144 : 04

THE EPISTLE TO THE READER.

THE Author of this Diſcourſe, *pretends* not to ſo great a name as to expect, That his Aſſertions ſhould be ſwallowed without chewing, embraced without examination upon his Authority: And indeed, he ſees not the need of any ſuch *Pretence* for ſuch an End; for he preſents the Reader but with the *Doctrine* of the *Proteſtant Divines*, whoſe name and authority (if there be any defect in its evidence) might challenge ſuch a Veneration, as may forbid any haſty or rough oppoſition of what they have unanimouſly conſented in. As to his Performance in compiling, he is aware, that not himſelf, but the Reader muſt and will be judge; and therefore to prevent the trouble of bringing a *Writ of Error* againſt his Judgment, the Author thinks it needful to give an account of the *occaſion of the Compoſure*, the *manner of handling the*

Subject, the *reaſon of the Publication at this time*, and the *weight of the Controverſie*.

As for the Occaſion; About Eighteen Years ſince Three Reverend Divines Mr. *William Jenkyn*, Mr. *Chriſtopher Fowler*, and Mr. *William Cowper* (with whom the Author had the honour to be intimately acquainted) did often in his hearing complain, of the increaſe of many dangerous Errours in Doctrine, ſince the Year 1660. In which complaint the Author alſo joyned, and withal gave them an account of a *Collection* which he had begun out of the moſt noted Authors, and caſt under Four Heads (*viz. Socinianiſm, Popery, Arminianiſm, Hobbeiſm*) which account they encouraged him to augment and perfect, as accordingly he did. And the Reverend Mr. *Jenkyn*, was ſo well ſatisfied in the fidelity of the Collector, that upon occaſion of a Conteſt between a Divine and Himſelf, he Tranſcribed ſo many of the Collections as he thought meet, and publiſhed them in his *Latin* Book, entituled, *Celeuſma*. And the Report of thoſe *Collections* came to the Ears of the *Houſe of Commons*; when there aroſe ſome Debates about Religion, about 1678. and the *Chairman* of the Committee for Religion, Mr. *Dubois*, of *London*, Merchant; ſent the Reverend

Reverend Mr. *William Cowper*, for those Collections which had, the Popish *Errours*, *Names of the Authors*, and of the *Licensers* in one *Column*, and the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, out of the *Articles* and *Homilies*, in another *Column*, and the *Collectors* name subscribed.

When these *Collections* were weighed, the Committee made Report, and the House was startled at it; and it was thought, the *Authors* and *Licensers* would have been called to account, had not the *Prorogation* of the *House* prevented it.

But to return to the *Triumvir* after the *Collection* above mentioned, they proposed to the *Collector* another Task, viz. To Draw up for the Press some (at least) of the *Principal Arguments* against the *Errours* contain'd in the *Collection*, and a concise Reply to the most specious Objections; which, as to Popery and Arminianism accordingly was done to their Content.

And what is now tender'd, is a part of what was intended for the Press long since, in compliance with their requests; had not the Authors call into the *Countrey*, and the death of those worthy Divines hindred his further Incouragement, without which he was as a Ship becalm'd.

As for the manner of handling the Subject; It is handled conciſely, that the Reader may not be diſcouraged from buying by the Price, nor from reading by the Bulk, and as plainly as the *nature* of the *Subject* would bear; which is done for the Advantage of *Private Chriſtians*, many of whom are concerned about the Differences in theſe Points.

The Author well remembers, how much ſorrow and wonder that Pious and Prudent Gentleman, *Henry Aſhurſt, of London, Eſq*; (now aſcended to Glory) expreſt, at the *joyning of works with faith in our Juſtification*, by a *Divine of Note* (and whom he had a great Eſteem for) and there are others living, that look upon the ſame *Divine's* (and his *Followers*) *Errour* in that Point with great regret.

And that the *Diſcourſe* might be more ſuited to the capacity of the meaneſt Reader, capable of underſtanding Controverſies, the Author hath thought fit to caſt the *materials* into the *Form* of a *Dialogue*, which *method* he was encouraged to, by the good reception which the worthy Divine Mr. *Matthew Pool's Dialogue*, and a *Friendly Debate* of the Authors met with al, ſome years ſince; and by the advantage which it affords to the *Reader*, whoſe attention is *quickned*

quickned by *alternate Diſcourſe*, which is *dulled* by a ſeries of *cloſe Argumentation*. The Author is not ignorant of the *Exception* which lies againſt this method of handling Controverſies: That the *Compoſer* gives himſelf an advantage, (and too often uſes it) to make his *Antagoniſt* ſay, not what himſelf *thinks*, but what the *Compoſer* pleaſes: but this Author is willing to bear the *ſhame* of *Diſingenuity*, if he be found guilty in that kind. And yet being ſenſible of ſome appearance of ſuch guilt, he thinks himſelf concerned to prevent cenſure by an Apology *once* or *twice* (at moſt) he brings in the *Galation*, as giving the *Pauline Divines* contemptuous words: but they are the very ſame which a *Divine* of that *Denomination gives them in Print*. And now and then the *Galation* is repreſented as at a loſs for an Anſwer; the true reaſon whereof is, that the *Author* had neither met with any writer that anſwers ſome of the *Pauliſt* Arguments, nor could he excogitate a tolerable Reply. And ſometimes the *Galation* is introduced as inclinable to face about and embrace the Truth he had relinquiſhed, but that fault may admit of this fair excuſe; That the *Pauliſt* ſuppoſes his *Antagoniſt* ſo honeſt-hearted, as to be willing to acknowledge his Errour,

when convinced of it; and to ſuppoſe him convinced who makes no reply to the Argument produced, is no more unreaſonable, than that a Priſoners ſtanding mute at the *Bar* ſhould be taken for a *Confeſſion* of his Guilt. And indeed the Author of this *Conference* hath been ſo far from repreſenting his Antagoniſts notions by halves, that he hath *explained* them when they ſeemed obſcure, and added ſtrength to their Arguments where they ſeemed to need it. And the Author hath given the Titles of *Pauliſt* and *Galatian* to the Dialogiſts, becauſe the Controverſie here agitated is the ſame, with that between *Paul* and the *Galatians*(*viz.*) whether we are juſtified by Faith or Works, *Gal.* 2. 16. *ch.* 3. 11, 12. The meaning of which *terms*, and the difference aſſigned between the Controverſie then on foot, and now, is conſidered in the following Conference.

The *Author* hath not named the *Authors* nor *Books*, which he writes againſt; and to that *omiſſion* he could hardly reconcile his own thoughts. He apprehended it might ſeem an *effect* of *fear*, to provoke *perticular Perſons*; and yet he conſidered, that ſuppoſing it was ſo, yet that fear was not altogether unreaſonable in him, who hath been a frequent Witneſs of Mens Impatience

ence of *Contradiction*; of their being as *hot* as a *Taylors Gooſe*, tho not ſo *weighty*; and that the *End aimed at* might be obtained otherwiſe; and why then ſhould a writer court ſpleen, and be fond of reproaches? eſpecially ſuch as diſparage his skill in his Profeſſion; of which the moſt Pious and Learned *Durham* took notice, and modeſtly retorted: *and tho unlearned and unread Divines, be the Epithets of the oppoſers of this Doctrine, yet poſſibly experience may ſhow, that ſuch may moſt readily be the Embracers of it. Expoſ. on Rev. 3. p. 146.* and he ſpeaks of the very Doctrine this Treatiſe oppoſes.

The *End* aimed at, in ſpeaking to *things* not *Perſons* is, That the Diſcourſe here offer'd *may be weighed in an even ballance* (to uſe *Jobs* phraſe, *Job.* 31. 6) not *poized by the hand*; and this end is more likely to be obtain'd, by the courſe above mentioned: for the oppoſers of the Doctrine here defended, when they find not their own *Names* called in *Queſtion*, may more calmly Deliberate before they paſs Sentence; and their *Followers* (who have their *Perſons in admiration*) may poſſibly be induced to conſider *what* is ſaid, when they know not againſt whom; otherwiſe they might indulge themſelves in the *Heathens* humour, *Facilius effecerit, quiſquis objecerit, crimen honeſtum,*

neſtum, quàm turpem Catonem Sen. *He would rather call Vice Vertue, than* Cato *vicious*: And they may embrace Errour for Truth, wander with their guides, rather than believe they could miſtake their way.

And the Author of this Diſcourſe hath cited but few Proteſtant Divines (and thoſe ſuch as the Dialogiſts might have read, or quotations out of them; becauſe his Deſign is not to prove the *Matter of Fact*, ſimply by their *Teſtimonies* (which is altogether needleſs to thoſe who have peruſed them, with any heedfulneſs and judgment) but by laying their Arguments and Replies, to their Oppoſers Objections, as cloſe as may be together, that the Reader may paſs an Impartial Judgment upon *Fact* and *Right*; that this is their *Doctrine*, and that *it is true.*

The reaſon of the Publication, is not the want of Authors that ſpeak fully and clearly to the Controverſie in our Native Language; as Mr. *Anthony Burgeſſe*, Mr. *Samuel Rolles*, Mr. *John Troughton*, *&c.* (which latter deſerves Peruſal, particularly for the Proof he makes, of the natural Tendency of our Antagoniſts Doctrine to *Socinianiſm*, *&c.*)

But a *Compliance* with the *Importunity* of ſome *Friends*, who have entertain'd the

the better Opinion of the Diſcourſe, becauſe they knew that the three *worthy Divines* before mentioned had given their *Imprimatur* to it, and it's no uncommon Obſervation, that *new Books* like *new Faſhions* are moſt *in requeſt*; but indeed, the chief Motives are, *That a great deal of Matter is crowded into a little room.* The Book is like the *Picture of a Fight*, wherein are more *Heads* of Men and Horſes than *whole Bodies*; by which courſe, whether he hath done *right* or *wrong* to the Cauſe, is not for himſelf to ſay. To affirm the *former*, would be *Immodeſt Pride*; to affirm the *latter*, *Proud Modeſty*: And that the *Author is willing to enter his proteſt againſt Errours*, which he does greatly diſlike, and the rather, becauſe many Divines of better Abilities (for reaſons beſt known to themſelves) are contented to be *Spectators*, rather than *Parties* in this *Quarrel*, in a time when theſe Errours ſpread like a *Gangrene*.

And now the *Weight of the Controverſie* expects its room, in this Epiſtle. Some indeed of our *Engliſh Proteſtant Divines* ſpeak *ſlightly* of it; one upon *Rev.* 3. 1. hath this Paſſage: *Thou haſt a Name that thou liveſt, as being ſo full of Zeal for or againſt this Ceremony, and that Opinion, with hot*

hot and nice Disputes about Faith and Justification, and the time of these nice Disputes himself assigns (viz.) *When Protestantism had become the Religion of Nations and Kingdoms*; and thence weknow very well (without being put to the trouble of guessing) that the *Disputes* were about *Justification by Faith or Works*, &c. Another Divine says, *As far as I can see, St.* Paul *never meddles with a matter of that nicety*; *Whether a single act of Faith be the condition of our Justification, as it is distinguished from Evangelical Obedience*—— and a little after; *I know the subtilty of later times hath made St.* Paul *dispute in the matter of Justification, not as one bred up at the feet of* Gamaliel, *but of the Mr. of the Sentences.*

The Author thinks it unmeet to let this latter passage pass without this brief Animadversion; That if that *learned Divine* intends *that distinction* (as probably he does) *fides sola justificat, sed non quæ sola, i. e.* Faith *alone* justifies, but not that Faith which *is alone.* There seems to be no more *subtilty* in that, than in this *distinction* drawn from St. *Paul's Doctrine, Christus qui Deus mortuus est, sed non quâ Deus.* That is, Christ who is *God* dyed; but he died not *as God*, which it is to be hoped that worthy Divine approves of, notwithstanding its Subtilty. But there is a Third Divine who

who bears us in hand, That the common Opinion that juſtifying Faith, as juſtifying, doth conſiſt in one ſingle Act is a wretched miſtake; and if ſo, then ſurely the *miſtake* is of ſome *conſequence*, or elſe his *Epithite* is very *Hyperbolical.*

But not to tranſgreſs the *Laws of architecture*, in making a *large Porch* before a *little Houſe*: The Author recommends to the Readers Conſideration, Mr. *Durhams Sentiment* of the Doctrines oppoſed in this Diſcourſe.

If by this, all the former Doctrine of Juſtification be enervated, Where are we till now? If it ſtand ſo, as the followers thereof may attain Heaven; what is the uſe of this ſo full a mould, with ſo much profeſſed danger in, and diſſatisfaction with the former? Will it not be welcome to Papiſts to have Proteſtants ſpeaking in their Termes, and homologating them in condemning the former Language of the moſt Eminent Reformers, &c. *Rev.* 3 [pag. 146. in 4°.] and preſently after he ſubjoynes, *If under this new Model another matter is comprehended, than formerly hath been intended by other expreſſions, in the writings of others, it cannot be ſo eaſily approved, leſt we ſhould condemn the Generation of Gods People, who have gone before us*, Id. Ib. And if their Doctrine be the ſame for Subſtance with the old *Galatians*,

ans, the Apoſtle hath paſſed this *cenſure* upon it, that it is another Goſpel, *ch.* 1.6. [*i. e.* quite different from what he taught] yet not another, but a *Perverſion of the Goſpel of Chriſt*, *v.* 7. and hath denounced a Curſe againſt the *Teachers* of it, *v.* 8. and *learners* too, *ch.* 54. And what Defence our *Modern Galatians* can make for themſelves will ſoon appear (for the Tryal will not be long) they being now brought to the Bar) if the Reader will but take his *Place* on the *Bench*.

London, March 6. 1694.

Tho. Danſon.

Poſtſcript.

POSTSCRIPT.

THE *Author of the following Diſcourſe thinks it meet to anſwer two objections*; one *which hath been made againſt the* Publication *of it* (viz.) *That the peace of the Church is not conſulted thereby*; *to that* Calvin *ſhall return an Anſwer*: The Purity of the Doctrine [*of juſtification*] (*of that he ſpeaks*) is to be conſtantly maintained, though Heaven and Earth ſhould be mingled together. The Name of Peace is Plauſible, but Curſed is that Peace which is bought with the loſs of the Doctrine of Chriſt, by which [*Doctrine*] alone we coaleſce into an holy Unity. [Acts Ap. 15. 1.] *And there is another which he foreſees likely to be made*; *that ſome* Tenents *are here confuted which their aſſertor hath* retracted. *The ground of the Allegation muſt be, that he once ſignified he would have the meaſure of his Judgment taken rather from other Books of his, than that out of which a Collection is here made. But that Retractation was but in general terms*; *and it ſeems evident that his Judgment was not changed, by his defence of the ſame notions againſt divers Learned men, who wrote againſt them*; *and by this* Commendation of the Orthodoxneſs

ness *of a certain writer*, in explaining those Texts that meddle with Justification, and Remission of Sins, with Faith and Works, *which Explications contain the summ of the most Heterodox Opinions about these points, in that* pretendedly *retracted Book, and therefore are some passages quoted out of that* commended Writer *in the* Conference *now presented to the Reader*; *and besides if the* Assertor *of the* Tenents *above mentioned had* really *retracted them, unless he had imitated* Chillingworths *Candor* (*who answered his own Arguments against* Protestantism *in Print*) *it might seem needful to refute them, because there are many who still retain them, and therefore either do not believe his change of Judgment, or if they do, yet they take his* Second Thoughts *to be not better, but* worse *than his first. And indeed it is easier to* thrust *a Man into a deep* Ditch, *than to pluck him out again*; *to* lead *him into an Errour, than to draw him off from it.*

T. D.

ERRATA.

P. 6. l. 5. r. *pardoning*. p. 7. l. 13. *for Psal.* r. *P.* p. 12. p. 25. *after and* r. *the grand motive to it.* p. 13. l. ult. *blot of.* p. 15. l. 26 *blot out by, and add, in the instance.* p. 56. l. 13. *after righteous add because.* p. 29. r. *score.* p. 60. l. 13. *after sense*) r. *that is.* p. 19. r. *Gospel.* p. 65. l. 5. r. *Tull.* p. 67. l. 5. r. *works.* p. 70. l. 7. r. *whereof.* p. 78. l. 19. *blot out is, before our.* p. 80. l. 27. *after eye add, on the brasen Serpent.*

A Friendly Conference BETWEEN A PAULIST AND A GALATIAN.

Pauliſt. WELL met Old Friend: It is as great a rarity to ſee you, as to ſee a *Fly* in the *Winter* time, What is the matter that you decline my Company, which you formerly frequented?

Galatian. To deal ingeniouſly with you, Difference in Opinion breeds ſome alienation in Affection. I am come off to the

New Methodiſts, and you adhere to the *Old*, in the Doctrine of Juſtification.

Paul. I do not approve of the Names you give each Party; for our difference is not in *Method*, but *Doctrine*. If they were to be *Biſhop'd (Confirm'd)* I mean, and I might be *Godfather*. (for in *Confirmation, a New Name* is ſometimes given, which takes place of the Name given in *Baptiſm*) I would call the former *Modern Galatians*, the latter *Old Pauliſts*, and this *Name*, I am not aſhamed to own. I am perfectly of our *Saviours* Judgment, *No Man having drank Old Wine, ſtraight way deſireth New*; for he ſaith, *the Old is better*, Luk. 5. *ult.*

Gal. You do ill to *Nick-Name* us *Galatians*, and to challenge the Honour to your ſelves of being *Pauliſts*, which belongs to us.

Paul. If your Opinion be the ſame with the *Galatians*, I do but ſlander you with a *Word of Truth*; and that 'tis ſo, I ſhall prove in due time. As for the *Honour* you aſpire to, I will as eaſily believe you can ſhew me a *black Swan* (unleſs on a Sign-poſt) as believe your Party to be *Pauliſts* in this Point of *Juſtification*; till you have proved, that *Paul* was for *Juſtification by Works*, who ſo often,

often, and ſo expreſly denies it; And upon his Oath aſſerts, that, it was not his practice to eat his own Words; as *God is true, Our Word toward you was not Yea, and Nay,* 2 Cor. 1. 18.

Gal. Paul denies Juſtification by Works of the *Law*, but not by Works of the *Goſpel.*

Paul. But what if this be a *Diſtinction* without a *Difference.* I have been taught that the *Goſpel* (ſtrictly taken) is no *Law*, (and ſo hath no *Works*) but is only a *Set* (as I may call it) of *New Revelations*, (*viz.* of Chriſt's Perſon, Natures, Offices, Promiſes,) and *New Objects* of Old Duties, and *New Motives* to inforce them. Even our Word, *Goſpel* is as much, as *Good-ſpell* (or Speech) from the matter of it.

Gal. It is no wonder that you are ſo ill taught, for *Your Teachers are Vulgar and Unſtudied Divines.*

Paul. Good words Friend, my *Teachers* have been the *Firſt Reformers*, and their *Succeſſors*, and ſurely they do not merit ſuch a *Leſſening Character*, as you give them. And I have known the time, when you had other thoughts of them, you and I have been diligent readers of many of their Books, and were wont

to compare Notes with great Satisfaction. And we have been frequent hearers of ſome of them, as Arch-Biſhop *Uſher*, Biſhop *Reynolds*, Dr. *Goodwin*, Dr. *Owen*, Mr. *Nye*, &c. Mr. *Vines*, Mr. *Anthony Burgeſs*, Mr. *Calamy*, Mr. *Jenkyns*, Mr. *Chriſtopher Fowler*, Mr. *Charnock*, &c. And we embraced their *Doctrine* (which they agreed in, though they differed in their Judgments about *Church Diſciplines* and *Government*) and what's the matter, that you have now forſaken it? I am well aſſured, that heretofore, you, as well as I, would have ſtarted at the mention of *Juſtification by Works*, and of a *Firſt* and *Second Juſtification*. And we ſhould have cried out, *Popery*, *Popery* with open mouth.

Gal. I think our *Latter Divines* have *Cleared* the Doctrine of Juſtification. And though they uſe the *Popiſh Terms*, their Senſe is different.

Paul. I wiſh it may not appear, they have *Muddied* it rather; and that you may not be cheated with *Old Boots* new vamped, and coloured, inſtead of a *New pair*.

Gal. You mean, (I ſuppoſe) that I ſhall have *Popery* impoſed upon me in a *Diſguiſe*.

Paul.

Paul. I will reſerve my meaning to my ſelf, till I have heard what difference you will aſſign between *Their Doctrine* and the *Popiſh*, when I make enquiry of you about it in the proceſs of our Diſcourſe. Yet I ſhall tell you, that I often compare them to *England* and *Scotland*, which are Several Kingdoms, but near borderers. (parted but by a ſmall River) And yet ſometimes, I check my ſelf for ſo favourable an Opinion of them; when I remember what *Calvin* ſays, *The Papiſts ſeem to themſelves very acute, when they alledge, that they attribute nothing to Works, but by the Mediation of the Grace of Chriſt, as if the errour of the* Galatians *were any other,* [*viz.* then that by the Grace of Chriſt they were Juſtified by Works;] *for they did not believe they did either apoſtatize from Chriſt, or renounce his Grace,* Calvin *in Gal.* 5. 2.

But to leave theſe Altercations, let us now proceed to a Diſcuſſion of the Point wherein we differ, which is, *Whether our good Works be the Condition of our Juſtification before God?* You hold the *Affirmative*, we the *Negative*; and I will be *Opponent*, you the *Reſpondent*; but do you explain the terms of the *Queſtion*, that there be no wrangling about them.

Gal. By *Good Works* we mean, the *Works of the Goſpel*; and done by the help of *Special Grace*: By *Juſtification* we intend, Acceptance of our Perſons, as Righteous, and Pradoning all our Sins; *before God*, notes an Oppoſition to, *before Man*: (mentioned *Luke* 16. 15.) By *Condition* we uuderſtand according to the *Lawyers* Definition, (it being a Law Term) that is called a Condition untill the performance whereof, the Donor of any thing is not actually obliged to the Donation. [*Navar.* Enchyr. p. 482.]

Paul. I conſent to your Explications of the Terms of the Queſtion (except that of the *Subject* of it, *Good Works.*)

And therefore I will firſt prove, That *there are no Works of the Goſpel*, and ſo they cannot be the *Condition* of Juſtification; and next that, *Works done by the help of ſpecial Grace, are not the Condition of our Juſtification.*

1. I prove that *There are no Goſpel Works*, and this I ſhall chooſe to do out of Mr. *Anthony Burgeſs's Vindiciæ Legis*, becauſe his Lectures were Preached and Printed at the deſire of the *London* Miniſters, *An.* 1646. And Approved of as *Judicious* and *Elaborate* (as appears by their Teſtimony prefixed to the Book) And they were Perſons

Persons that understood Protestant Doctrine. 1. As to Faith, he says, *The nature of Justifying Faith, was in* Adam, *though there was not such a particular Object, about which it might be exercised; for a thing may be, for the nature of it, and yet not have such a Name, which it hath from a certain Object which now is not; or from some Effects, which it cannot now produce. So Mercy and Grace was in God for the nature of it always, but as it hath a respect to a miserable Creature, that was not, till the Creature was made so,* Psal. 139. 2. As to *Repentance* (he says) *the Gospel (taken strictly) is not a Doctrine of Repentance; but comprehends no more, then the glad tidings of a Saviour.* ibid. p. 262.

Gal. But Divines call *Faith* and *Repentance* the Two *Evangelical Commands.*

Paul. Mr. *Burgesse* takes notice of this Objection, and Answers it, *That then they use the Word more largely; for the Doctrine of Christ and the Apostles; but (in a strict sense) it's only a promise of Christ and his Benefits:* And hence he adds, *The Gospel doth not terrifie and accuse. Indeed there are woful Threatnings to him, that rejecteth Christ; yea, more severe, than to him, that rejected* Moses, *but this ariseth from the Law joyned in Practical use with the Gospel.*

Gal. Is not Christ called a *Law-giver*, Isa. 33. 22? And surely then *Faith* and *Repentance* must be *his Laws?*

Paul. 1. We deny him not to be such. And his institution of the Sacraments, Ministry, *&c.* are sufficent ground for such *Denomination.*

2. As to the Instances you give, *Christ* Answers his Title, not by *Enacting* those Laws, but by *Interpreting* the first Commandment of the Moral Law, as containing them in it; (*Interpreting* or *Declaring Law.* (where there's any doubt of the Meaning) being an *Act* of the *Legislative Power.*) Hence *Christ* is said to come to *Fulfil the Law*, Matth. 5. 17. where the Principal thing intended, is an *Explication* of it, as of larger extent, and more Spiritual, than the *Pharisees* imagined [see *ver.* 21. 22, 27, 28.] and notable to this purpose is Christ's *Explication* of the sum of the Second Table, *Love to our Neighbour*, as including *Mercy* to him, *Mat.* 20. 27, 37. which Man in innocency was not under an *Actual Obligation to*, for want of an *Object*, (*viz.*) *Misery* which is your *Great Pretence* for making *Faith* and *Repentance New Gospel Laws* (and which when you out with it, I shall Reply to.)

Gal.

Gal. Faith is called *A Law*, Romans 3. 27.

Paul. But not a *New Law*, or *Goſpel Precept*.

Gal. Believing is called *God's Work*, Joh. 6. 29. and his *Command*, 1 Joh. 3. 23.

Paul. I Anſwer, That Believing is a Commandment indeed (and ſo a Work) but whether it belongs to the *Law* or *Goſpel* is not there determined.

Gal. It is there determined by mentioning a *New Object*, *God's Son*, Jeſus Chriſt.

Paul. That's not a ſufficient Reaſon, you may as well ſay, That a *New Viſible Object*, requires a *New ſight*; or (which is more appoſite) that a *New Prophet* required a *New Law* to Oblige Perſons to believe him; whereas there was no more requiſite to that end, than ſufficient *Evidence* that he was a *Prophet*.

Gal. But in the Innocent State, Man needed not a Saviour, nor did the Law admit one. And how then that Law can oblige to believe in one, I cannot ſee.

Paul. Nor do I ſay, that Man was *Actually obliged* to believe in a *Saviour*, till he needed him. But that the ſame Law that Obliged *Adam* and his Poſterity

to

to believe in God, obliged them to believe in Christ when he was revealed. As for the Law's *not admitting of a Saviour*, if you understand by that Term *Law*, *the Covenant of Works* we grant, that did not admit of a Saviour: But if you intend the *Law* precisely as a *Rule of Faith*, it admitted him to be the Object of Faith (as being the *Great God*, as well as our *Saviour* (as he is called, *Tit.* 2. 13.)

Gal. But *the Law is not of Faith*, Gal. 3. 12.

Paul. True, but it is not said, that *Faith is not of the Law*, [*i. e.* a Duty to which the *Law Natural* or *Moral* binds us, upon the Revelation of a New Object God the Redeemer.] Yet (not to impose upon you) I must confess that Faith, is no more of the Law, than the Law of Faith in the sense of the Text, which is, that they are contrary to each other, in respect of the way of Justification (*Viz.* by our *Own Righteousness*, and by the Righteousness of *another* (*Viz.* Christ.)

Gal. I will now beat you with your own Weapon; for if it be so, then the Faith that depends upon another's Righteousness, cannot be commanded by the same

ſame Law, that required dependance upon our own Righteouſneſs.

Paul. I will wring it out of your hands, and beat you with it. There is no more Abſurdity in this being a Duty of the Law, becauſe of the *Contrariety* you alledge between the *Objects* of it in the *Innocent* and *Nocent* State of Man, than that *Black* and *White* being *contrary Colours*, ſhould yet be the *Object* of the *ſame Senſe* (*Viz.*) ſight; or that *Heat* and *Cold* being *contrary Qualities* ſhould be the *Object* of the *ſame Senſe* of Feeling: or (to give an inſtance in Duties) that the ſame Natural Law (*Viz.*) *Thou ſhalt Love thy Neighbour as thy ſelf*; that obliged *Adam before his Fall*, to love his Wife, when ſhe was his *Friend*, ſhould not oblige him, after his fall, to love her when ſhe was become his *Enemy*, by betraying him to his Ruine.

Gal. It cannot ſink into my head, that *Repentance* ſhould be a duty of the *Law*, becauſe the *Law* did not admit of Repentance.

Paul. If you mean, as a *Condition of Life* I *grant* it; But if you mean, *as a Duty*, I deny it; and I will give you a Reaſon from 1 *John* 3. 8. which plainly imports, that the Devil was obliged

to

to repent, how elſe could impenitent ſinners be ſaid to be of *the Devil*, becauſe they kept on in a courſe of ſin (as he does) and ſure the Devils obligation did not ariſe from the New *Goſpel Law*, but from the Old *Natural Law*, ſo far as it was common to Men and Angels.

Gal. I never heard this Argument before, nor indeed can I anſwer it. But I believe our *Divines* can.

Paul. Conſult them, and when we meet again, let me know their Anſwer.

Gal. Repentance was not conſiſtent with a *Sinleſs State*, and how then could Man be under a Law to it.

Paul. The main *Ingredients* of *Repentance* were conſiſtent with that State, as a *Purpoſe* of heart againſt Sin, and to continue in obedience and *Hatred* of ſin, and a *due ſence of Sin*, (*viz.*) of it in its own *Nature* (as a tranſgreſſion of the Law of God) and in its *Effects* (Death being threatned to Sinners, *Gen.* 2. 17.) and an *Apprehenſion of the goodneſs of God*, in preſent injoyments and future hopes, (for which latter, the *Tree of Life*, Gen. 3. 22. gave ground ſufficient) and why *Sorrow for ſin committed*, and a *purpoſe* and endeavour of *New Obedience* from an *Apprehenſion*

prehenſion of the Mercy of *God in Chriſt* ſhould require a new Law, to oblige to them, I cannot underſtand. The Obſervation of the *Firſt* day of the Week in the times of the Goſpel, hath no *New Precept*, becauſe the *Fourth Command* obliges us, without one: The morality of the fourth Command lies not in keeping the *Seventh* day in order, but *one day in Seven*, and which of the *Seven* appears from Chriſt reſting from the Work of Redemption (a greater Work than that of Creation) and advancing it by that reſt, above all other days) and why then is there any need of a *New Law* to oblige us to Repentance, becauſe of New Objects of thoſe Duties, and New Arguments to inforce them?

Gal. I am a little ſtaggerd at your Argumentation.

Paul. I wiſh you may be brought off by it to embrace the *Old Truth*; in order whereunto, I would have you conſider; that if your *Arguments* are of any weight to prove *Faith* and *Repentance*, *New Laws* of the *Goſpel*, then they may be extended to our *Love* to God as *Redeemer*, to Prayer to, and Meditation on him, *as ſuch*, to *Love* the Saints as *Believers* of, and *Penitents*, and Love to

our

our Enemies, Mercy to the Miſerable, Patience under Afflictions; Hope and Joy in the proſpect of a good Iſſue of them, *&c.* For *Innocent Man* was not under an *Actual Obligation* to thoſe Duties, as being *Inconſiſtent with his State.*

Gal. Though I do not remember that our Divines do apply the ſame Arguments to theſe Duties, that they do to *Faith* and *Repentance*, yet I cannot deny, but they are applicable. But what will you infer from my grant?

Paul. Stay a little for my Anſwer. Is *Faith* and *Repentance*, and thoſe other Duties now mentioned the *utmoſt bounds* of your *New Goſpel Law?*

Gal. I cannot ſay ſo. We make *Love and its Works the condition of Juſtification*; and ſo *Branches* of the *New Goſpel Law.*

Paul. Now I will Anſwer your Queſtion. I infer from your *Firſt Grant*, that the *New Law* hath incroached upon the *Old*, as the Sea does ſometimes upon the Land. The *Old* (*i. e.* the *Natural* or *Moral Law*) did once oblige to love God, pray to, and meditate on him, as a *Creator* and *Friend*; but now God is become a *Redeemer*, a *Reconcil'd Foe*; the Old Law is *Vacated*, as to thoſe duties to him under thoſe *New Relations* mentioned

tioned (wherein he now ſtands) which methinks is as abſurd, as if that Law which obliges me to love my *Friend*, whilſt a *Single* Man, ſhould ceaſe its Obligation when he is *Married*. Again, From your *Second Conceſſion* I infer, That your *New Law* hath ſerved the *Old*, as *Aaron's Rod did the Magicians Rods, ſwallow them all up*, Exod. 7. 12. And whereas the *Socinians* make Chriſt to *add* ſome *New Precepts* to the *Old Law*; ye *Galatians* make him to *take away* all the Precepts from the *Old*, to Conſtitute his *Own New Law*. This is worſe then *Robbing* Peter, *to pay* Paul; (as our Proverb hath it) this is Robbing *God* to pay *Chriſt*: a *Robbery* which *Chriſt* diſclaims, *Matth.* 5. 17. and our Patron *Paul*, Rom. 3. laſt.

Gal. But we acknowledge the Old Law in force, as a *Rule* of Duty.

Paul. Very good: Though I do not ſee how the ſame Precepts ſhould belong to the Old and New Law at the ſame time. (For by calling the Goſpel Law, a *New Law*, ye make the firſt *Old*. *Now that which decayeth and waxeth Old, is ready to vaniſh away*, to borrow the expreſſion uſed of the *Old* and *New Teſtament* Diſpenſations, *Heb.* 8. laſt.) But that

that which I conclude with, upon your acknowledgment, is, that if beſides the proper Precepts of the *New Law*; thoſe of the *Old Law are adopted into your New Law*, as a Condition of Juſtification; then *the Covenant of Grace is properly and ſtrictly a Covenant of Works, and even of Works or Deeds of the Law*, which the Apoſtles denies, *Rom.* 3. 28. and you your ſelf a while ſince. And this will be yet more evident, if your *New Law* hath its *Threatnings*.

Gal. I cannot yet conceive, but that the *Goſpel* hath *Threatnings*, for the *Damnations* of Unbelievers, as well as the *Salvation* of Believers, is called the *Goſpel*, (which the Apoſtles were to Preach) *Mark* 16. 15, 16.

Paul. Damnation is part of the *Doctrine* Preached by the Apoſtles. But that it is not part of the Goſpel, may be gathered from *Rom.* 6. laſt, *The wages of Sin is Death*; *but the gift of God is Eternal Life, through Jeſus Chriſt our Lord.* Which *Oppoſition* ſounds to this ſenſe, that the *Threats* of the *Law* aſſign deſerved *Damnation*, the *Promiſe* of the *Goſpel* undeſerved *Salvation*.

Gal. But the Goſpel hath its Threats only againſt *Final Unbelief*, and *Final Impenitency*.

Paul.

Paul. Surely then it is very Partial; for every act of Unbelief and Impenitency is a ſin, and ſo deſerves Damnation: And why then ſhould thoſe Acts eſcape its threats; and if the *Goſpel* does not threaten them, then the *Law* muſt, *For the wages of Sin* (a ſingle Sin not continued in) *is Death*; (as you heard but now) and then it will follow, that *Unbelief* and *Impenitency* are Sins againſt the *Law*; becauſe it cannot threaten what is not a Tranſgreſſion of it. And ſo the conſequence of your *Aſſertion* will prove its irreparable ruine.

Again, I argue thus; If the *Goſpel* hath no *Threats* againſt *Defects* in Faith and Repentance, then ſuch Defects are no Tranſgreſſion of this *New Law*. (For if they were, it would threaten them, as well as *final Unbelief*, and *final Impenitency*.) And if ſo, then it will follow; either that you are not to Pray for the Pardon of them, or Power againſt them: Or if you do, (and think you are bound to do it) you muſt acknowledg, they are breaches of the *Old Law*, the Moral Law, which as the rule of Practice requires the perfection of every Act it injoyns.

Gal. Chriſt proceeds in executing his Kingly Office in his Church according to the *Threatnings* of the *Goſpel*, and ſurely Men are not turned over to the Law for Puniſhment for Sins againſt the Goſpel.

Paul. The Goſpel cannot threaten *greater* Evils for *Kind*, than the Law doth; and therefore I may ſay of the Goſpel, compared with the Law in its Threatnings, as *Solomon*, of any other Man compared with himſelf; *What can the Man do that cometh after the King; even that which hath been already done*, Eccleſ. 2. 12. And therefore though Chriſt be King of the Church, he cannot puniſh, but according to the threats of the Law. As for Sins againſt the Goſpel, we know no ſuch Sins. (as hath been ſaid) And I add, that ſo extenſive is the firſt Command of the Moral Law, that *Truſting* in the Lord *Jehovah* (that is *Chriſt*,) *Iſa.* 26. 4. is a branch of the duties required in it, and *Goſpel Unbelief* (which is ſtiled *A departure from the Living God*, Heb. 3. 12. (a Title agreeing to Chriſt) is a Sin forbidden by that command; and the acknowledging God to be *Our God*, Deut. 26. 17. and the not avouching him for *Our God*, Pſal. 81. 11.

is

is comprehended under the *Affirmative* and *Negative* of that Commad. (ſee *Aſſembly Catechiſm*) Again, *Inventors of evil things* are Sinners againſt the Moral Law, *Rom.* 1. 30. (for that was the Law which the *Roman Gentiles* were under) And if unnatural Luſts (partly intended in that Phraſe) though not mentioned in the Seventh Commandment were included under it; I cannot ſee why the *Rejection* of Grace offered to *Sinners* (*an evil thing invented by* Cain, *Heb.* 11. 4.) as well as the *Rejection* of Grace offered to *Innocent Man*; the ſlighting of the *Recovery* of Gods favour to the one, as well as of the *Continuance* of it to the other, ſhould not be included in the *Firſt Commandment.*

Gal. But Sins againſt the *Goſpel* are threatned with *greater Puniſhment* than Sins againſt the *Law*, *Mat.* 11. 22. 24.

Paul. Your Argument ſuppoſes that the ſame Law cannot make a difference, as to degrees of Puniſhment, for greater or leſſer breaches of it, the miſtake whereof will appear by *Adams* laying the blame of his own ſin in eating the forbidden Fruit, upon his *Wife*, and upon *God*, (as he does obliquely, *Gen.* 3. 12.) which were breaches of the *ſame* Natural

Law, yet the *Latter* was greater than the *Former*, becauſe *God is greater than Man*, Job 33. 12. And ſo it was puniſhable with more ſeverity. And therefore (by a parity of Reaſon) though the *Rejection* of *God's Offer* of *Reconciliation* to *Fallen Man*, who had given the Offence, be a greater ſin, than the *Rejection* of his offer of continuing *Friendſhip* with *Innocent Man* (abiding ſuch) yet they may be Sins againſt the ſame Law, and by it, one puniſhed with greater Puniſhment than the other, and ſo there's no need of a *Goſpel Law* to aſſign greater Puniſhments to *Goſpel Sins*, (as you imagine) for if the *Natural Law* given to *Adam* did not, yet (at leaſt) the *Moral Law* given to his Poſterity on Mount *Sinai* may ſuffice for that end.

Gal. But why do you diſtinguiſh between thoſe Laws? I thought they had been but the ſame Law, in your Judgment.

Paul. Yes, ſo they are for ſubſtance, but yet there is this difference; that the *Former* did but *Implicitely* injoyn that Faith and Repentance which ye account the *ſpecial* and *proper Goſpel Laws*: But the *Latter Law* does *Explicitely* injoyn them, as being ſuitable *to*, And ſo the

Preſent

Preſent Duties of the Lapſed State, (as I proved even now) the Goſpel (as oppoſed to either of thoſe Laws (as I have diſtinguiſhed them) does but reveal a *New Object* of thoſe duties, a *Redeemer* the Object of *Faith,* and *Sin Committed,* the Object of *Repentance.*

Gal. I do not remember that I have heard divers of the things you alledge in this point.

Paul. But they are either thoſe which I have had from the eminent Divines above mentioned, (which ſtick like *Pitch* to my memory,) or they are eaſie and natural Deductions in my opinion, from their Doctrine. But before we go off this Point, I ſhall acquaint you with the late *Riſe,* or *Revival* rather of this controverſie, and thence with the *Danger* in a miſtake about it. (not yet mentioned,) The *Riſe* was from *Arminius,* who pretended that *Adam* had not *Power* of believing in Chriſt, and that therefore we could not loſe in *Adam* what he had not.

Gal. But what Arguments did he urge for the proof of his Aſſertion?

Paul. That *Adam* in innocency had no need of believing in Chriſt. That Faith was not commanded by the Law,

and therefore *Adam* was not bound to believe; for the Law only was given to him, and that none could believe but a Sinner.

Gal. Theſe are our very Arguments. I could not have thought that our *Iſraelites* had been forced to go down to the *Philiſtines* to ſharpen their Weapons. But are you ſure of this you affirm?

Paul. I read it in the Learned *Peter du Moulin's Anatomy of Arminianiſm*, c. 11. and I have read the ſame Arguments in Mr. *Anthony Burgeſſe* (before cited) and heard them cited as *Arminian Arguments* by divers of our *Pauline Divines*; and if you doubt my veracity, you may read the Authors I name, and enquire of your own Divines.

Gal. But what did *Arminius* infer from his Poſitions which you cite?

Paul. That *God is bound to give all Men power to believe on Chriſt*, &c. And this *Moulin* calls an *Impious Opinion*; and ſays, that ſeeing he intends the denial of *Adams* power to believe, *&c.* For the eſtabliſhment of it; therefore this Queſtion is not of ſmall moment, nor to be perfunctorily handled.

Gal.

Gal. But pray what's the *Danger* in our miſtake about the Goſpel's being a New Law?

Paul. That ye may daſh upon *Arminius*'s *Rock*, make the ſame wretched inference that you heard but now from it: But enough of this Queſtion. The next thing that I am to oppoſe is that *Works done by Grace, are the Condition of our Juſtification.*

Argument. 1. No Works are the condition of our Juſtification, therefore not Works done by Grace. The *Antecedent* is evident, for the Apoſtle excludes from Juſtification *Works*, without any Epithite, *Rom.* 4. 2, 6. and *Deeds* [or Works] of the *Law*, Chap 3. 20, 27.

Gal. But that latter Phraſe limits the former to that kind of Works.

Paul. It hath been proved, that all Works are Works of the Law (and therefore I wave any farther Diſcourſe about *Goſpel Works*, (as your Phraſe is) only I ſhall ſuggeſt; that if the *Apoſtle* had underſtood and intended ſuch a difference of Works in relation to Juſtification, an *Hint* of that would ſoon have put an end to the controverſie.

Gal. He hath *Hinted* it when he calls *Faith a Law*, and oppoſes it to the *Law of Works*, Rom. 3. 27. And our Lord himſelf, when he calls *Believing the Work of God*, John. 6. 29.

Paul. Calvins Anſwer to the firſt Scripture is ſufficient, That *the name of a Law is impropely given to Faith which yet does not darken the Apoſtles meaning, which is as if he had ſaid, the Righteouſneſs of Works is commended in the Law; but Faith hath its own Law, which admits of no Righteouſneſs in Works of any ſort whatſoever.* And *Beza*, on the place (as I have heard him quoted) ſays, *The Apoſtle ſeems for the nonce to imitate the Jews Phraſe, who were Adverſaries of Grace, and had always the Name of the Law in their Mouths*; as to the other Scripture *Hutcheſon*'s Anſwer [in his Expoſition on *John*'s Goſpel] is very full. *Chriſts calling Faith a Work doth not impors that Faith as a Work doth juſtifie (for it is only the hand to receive Chriſt who is our Righteouſneſs.) But he gives it this Name, ſpeaking in their terms who doted on Works.* And even *Camero* (who is cryed up by your party) after his *Explication* of *John* 6. 29. to the ſame ſenſe with *Beza* and *Hutcheſon*, adds; *The Scripture always oppoſeth Faith to Works*

in

in the buſineſs of Juſtification. For Faith gives nothing to God, but only receives; but Works are, (as it were) Sacrifices of Thankſgiving, which we offer to God, for Faith is the Organ (or Inſtrument) and as it were the Souls hand whereby we receive Gods Benefits, Prælect in *Matth.* 16. 17. and *p.* 48. and hence I argue, That if Faith and Works are ſtill oppoſed to each other in the buſineſs of Juſtification then *Faith, is oppoſed to it ſelf, as a Work* [or act of Obedience to the command of Believing] conceive it thus, we may ſay of a *Beggar*, and of an *Handycrafts Man*, they have nothing but what they get by their *Hands*. But in a different ſenſe, the former, as he *receives* what is given him: the other as he *earns* by his Work, his Bread before he eats it. Otherwiſe the Apoſtles *Oppoſition* of *Faith* and *Works* would be as *Illogical*, as this; we live by *Bread*, not by *Food*; (which latter includes the former) Bread being one kind of Food.

Gal. But Love is a condition of Pardon, (a branch of Juſtification) as appears by, *Luk.* 7. 47.

Paul. All that can be concluded from that Scripture, is, that much *Love*, is an *Effect*, (and ſo a *Sign*,) not a *Cauſe* or *Condi-*

Condition of forgiving many Sins, ſee *ver.* 42. 43. and this I ſhall prove from the Learned *Pinck* (whom one of your party flurts at, but confutes not his interpretation) *I would alter one word in our Tranſlation, BECAUSE into THEREFORE, the ſenſe requires this Conſtruction; becauſe the whole ſcope of the Parable is to ſhew, that he loves moſt to whom moſt is forgiven, and not contrarily, that moſt is forgiven to him that loves moſt,* &c. *The conjunction ὅτι admits it; for albeit not in the pure Greek Idiom, yet in the Helleneſtick uſe of it, it ſo ſignifies,* &c. [*Trial of ſincere Love to Chriſt,* Ser. *on* Eph. 6. 24. *p.* 12. 13.] And *Calvin,* and other Proteſtant Divines gave the ſame Interpretation before *Pink.* And I am told, that the Learned *Mede* and *Hammond,* (who were great Criticks) do give Inſtances in Scripture, where the Greek word is taken for *therefore* (and are quoted by Mr. *Pools Latin Synopſis,* on *Luk.* 7. 47.)

Gal. Our Saviour after all theſe expreſſions of Love from the Penitent Woman, tells her, that her ſins are forgiven her, [*ver.* 48.]

Paul. Mr. *Pink* makes the Objection in theſe Words, and Anſwers; *This was but that Sentence of Abſolution for her greater*

ter comfort and assurance outwardly pronounced, of which no doubt but she had before some gracious inklings within, and the vertue whereof she had already tasted, though not in that comfortable measure, or distinct manner as she desired, [*Pink,* Ibid. p, 13. 14.]

Gal. I acknowledge this Scripture, is as insignificant to our cause, as a *Cypher* without a Figure in *Numeration.* But we can instance in an other *Grace* which is so expresly made a condition of forgiveness, as that you cannot elude it, (*viz.*) *Repentance,* Acts 5. 31.

Paul. I Answer, 1. That if Faith *as a Work,* be excluded from being a Condition of Justification (as I proved before) then *Repentance* which cannot be considered otherwise than as a *Work,* cannot be admitted. 2. (which is a confirmation of the first Answer) by *Faith* we *receive forgiveness* of Sins, *Acts* 26. 18. by *Repentance* we *Work* for it, (whereas God does *Frankly forgive Sinners,* Luk. 7. 42.)

Gal. The Words by *Faith* are joyned to *Sanctified* in the Text, not to receive.

Paul.

Paul. But. 1. *Calvin* refers those words to the other clauses foregoing, and makes the sense to be that *By Faith we possess all the good things offered in the Gospel*; and *Beza* puts a *Comma* after *Sanctified*; and affirms that *He found it so in Old Greek Copies of the New Testament* (as I have been told by our Divines) 2. If I grant you the benefit of our *Translation what you get by it, you may put in your eyes, and see never the worse,* for then *Repentance* (being a branch of Sanctification) must be *after Justification* (and so not *before* it) and so not a *condition* of it) It being a received *Rule* in Divinity, that *Justification is in order of nature before Sanctification,* as this is opposed to *Regeneration*; this latter term noting those gracious *Habits* which are *infused together*; that former, the *Acts* of the Habits, which [Acts] are drawn out by Faith's laying hold on Christ as a *Sanctifier:* And this is intimated, *Luke* 17. 5. where Disciples beg not an *increase* of their *Love,* but of their *Faith,* that they might forgive their offending Brother.

Gal. The mention of *Forgiving an offending Brother,* puts me in mind of a Duty which is made a *Condition* of Gods forgiveness, *Mat.* 6. 14.

Paul.

Paul. Elſe where *God's forgiveneſs* of us is made a *Motive* to our forgiveneſs of others, *Eph.* 4. laſt, which ſuppoſes a *Precedency* of Gods Act to ours, and alſo of our *Apprehenſion* of it. And therefore our forgiveneſs cannot (ſtrictly ſpeaking) be a *Condition of God's.*

Gal. Why then does Chriſt uſe that form of Words which ſeems to import, that 'tis a *Condition* of it?

Paul. Becauſe *our forgiveneſs* is an *Inſeparable effect* and *Indubitable ſign* of that *Faith* by which we obtain *Gods forgiveneſs*, and ſo we ſay that the Promiſe is not made to the *Effect* produced, but to the *Cauſe* producing it; not to *Our forgiveneſs* of others, but to the *Faith* it ſelf (as a good Tree bringing forth that good fruit) and the ſame Anſwer we give to thoſe paſſages of Scripture, which ſeem to make *Repentance* a Condition of forgiveneſs; which I may illuſtrate by *Mark* 7. 29. compar'd with *Matth.* 15. 28. it was not the Womans *Saying*, that obtained her Childs cure, but the *Faith* whereof that *Saying* was a *Sign* and *Effect.*

Gal. Your *Diſtinction* between *Faith* and *its effects* with reſpect to Juſtification is groundleſs. We ſay that *Faith* may be

called the *only condition* of the New Covenant, because all the rest are reducible to it, either as being *Presupposed* as necessary *Antecedents* or means; or *contained* in it, as its parts, or properties, or modifications, or else *Implied*, as its immediate product, *&c.*

Paul. Though the last, the *product* [or effect] of Faith be to our present purpose, yet I would ask you for an instance of *Antecedents* to Faith.

Gal. Repentance from dead works, Godly sorrow, *&c.*

Paul. I see one may live and learn. I had thought they had been *Effects*, and so *Consequents of Faith.* I have learned, that *without Faith 'tis impossible to please God*, Heb. 11. 6. But if your Notion be right, I must unlearn it again. For sure, he that hath *fulfilled a condition of the Covenant of Grace pleases God.*

Gal. No such matter, we say, there must be a concurrence of all *Duties* to make up the conditions, which have a promise of *Life.*

Paul. I suppose by *Life*, you mean (at least in part) *Justification of Life*, Rom. 5. 18. (or else you speak not to the Question in hand) and if so, then even with *Faith* it is impossible to please God; because

becauſe, that is but one *Condition more*; or in other words we are not juſtified by *Faith alone*, but by *Works too*. But pray what are the things *Contained* in Faith, as a part.

Gal. Love of Chriſt above all.

Paul. We Judge that *Grace* to be an *Effect* of Faith by warrant from *Gal.* 5. 6. *Faith worketh by Love. The Apoſtle makes Love (as it were) Faiths Inſtrument, by which it works, and who knows not the Inſtrument hath its Force, Motion and Action, not from it ſelf; but from the Workman.* [So *Luther* appoſitely on the place] Faith blows the fire of Love, and then uſes it as occaſion ſerves. I have asked you theſe Queſtions, that by convincing you of your *miſtakes* in your Anſwers, you may *ſuſpect the reſt of your Notions.* I have but one Queſtion more: What are the *Products* of Faith?

Gal. Sincere Obedience and Works of Love.

Paul. How theſe, which are *after* Juſtification, not only in order of *Nature*, but in *Time* ſhould be a *Condition* of *Juſtification*, is hard to conceive.

Gal. I wonder at your dulneſs, we diſtinguiſh between a firſt and *Second Juſtification*, the *firſt* whereof, is upon *meer Faith*,

Faith, the latter is upon *Sincere Obedience and Perſeverance.*

Paul. If I be *dull*, I think you are not very *ſharp*, (if I may judge by your *Diſtinction*) for I cannot find either *Name* or *Thing* of a *Second Juſtification* in Scripture: But I have found a place that baffles it, *Rom.* 1. 17. *Therein* [*viz.* in the Goſpel, *v.* 16.] *the Righteouſneſs of God*, [by which a Sinner is made Righteous to Juſtification, ſo called in oppoſition to *Mans righteouſneſs*, whereof he is the *Subject* or *Agent*, Rom. 10. 3. and becauſe *inherent* in and *performed* by him who is *God* (*viz.*) Chriſt, 1 *Cor.* 10. 30.] is *Revealed* [in oppoſition to Natural Knowledge, (there being no *Natural Chriſtianity*, though there be a *Natural Theology*) which term includes an exhibition of it (as *Gal.* 3. 23.) whence the *Goſpel* is called, *A Miniſtration of Righteouſneſs*, 2 Cor. 3. 9.] *From Faith to Faith* [there ſeems to be a word wanting to make up the ſenſe (*viz.*) *To be* [as *Jam.* 2. 5. *To be rich in Faith* (for Faith is not the cauſe but effect and end of Election] and the meaning is, to ſhew what *Juſtifying Righteouſneſs* he calls *Gods*, and is *revealed* in the *Goſpel* (*viz.*) that Righteouſneſs [not which is *begun* by *Faith*, and *carried* on by

by *Works*, but] which Juſtifies us firſt and laſt only by Faith; as for the Phraſe *from Faith to Faith* ['tis paralel to, *from Glory* to *Glory*, 2 Cor. 3. laſt] and 'tis intended to note, that the growth of Faith for Juſtification, will take riſe from the more diſtinct apprehenſion of the need of Gods Righteouſneſs only, for that end] *For the juſt ſhall live by Faith*, [cited out of *Habb.* 2. 4.] which words prove out of the *Old Teſtament*, the Doctrine of Juſtification by Faith, aſſerted in the *New*. And both the Hebrew and the Greek are ambiguous, and may be rendred, either *The Juſt by Faith ſhall live*, or (as our verſion) *The Juſt ſhall live by Faith*. If we take the former *Verſion*, then the conſequence is evident, he that is juſt by *Faith*, is not *Juſt* [and ſo nor lives] *by Works*. If the *latter*, he that *lives* by Faith muſt needs be ſuppoſed *Juſt* by it firſt; becauſe the ſame Righteouſneſs received by Faith, gives right to Juſtification and Salvation. I have been the longer upon this, becauſe your *Errour* herein is very *Groſs*.

Gal. 'Tis well you call *Whore* firſt; for if you had not been *too quick* for me, I ſhould have told you, that your opinion, that juſtifying Faith, as juſtifying, doth

 conſiſt

consist in any *one single Act*, is a *wretched mistake*.

Paul. But I am well assured, that it is an *happy Truth*: And this I will evince.

1. From your own *Concession* but now, that the *First* Justification is upon *meer Faith*, which is a single Act (*viz.*) an *Acceptance of Christ* as our Righteousness to Justification. As for the *Second* Justification, I am content it should be left to the wide World to shift for it self.

Gal. You mistake our term *meer Faith*, we understand it, of Faiths *immediate receiving Christ* as *King* and *Prophet*, (and in so doing to justifie,) as well as the receiving him as *Priest*.

Paul. This Answer may well have the name *Legion*; I will not say, for the many *Devils* but *Errours*, that it contains for.

1. Suppose we grant your notion of *Justifying Faith, as such*; that it hath *Christ* in all *his Offices* for its *Object*. How can faith *Immediately* receive Christ as *King* and *Prophet*? when as the receiving of him as *Priest*, must needs precede the receiving of him as *King* and *Prophet*; (if not in *Time*, yet in order of *Nature*) and so be the *immediate Act of Faith as Justifying*. Our common Catechism tells us, that *Faith receives Christ, as he is offered*

ed in the Goſpel, which particle *as* intimates that the *Order* of receiving him, is *directed* by the *Order* of the *Goſpels Offer.* And ſurely *Juſtification* is the *Firſt benefit offered* [ſee *Acts* 13. 38, 39. *Rom.* 3. 21, 22. *ch.* 8. 34. *ch.* 10. 10.] or Chriſt as our Righteouſneſs for Juſtification is firſt tender'd [which is the ſame thing in other words.]

Gal. But why may not that Particle *As,* refer to the *entireneſs of the Object* of Faith, or Chriſt in all his Offices?

Paul. Yes, it may, and does: but yet we affirm (and ſhall prove preſently,) that though Chriſt as Prophet and King, be the Object of *Juſtifying Faith,* yet he is *not of Faith, as Juſtifying,* and therefore the *As* muſt be underſtood alſo (as was ſaid.)

2. I Argue, If Faith as juſtifying does *immediately* receive Chriſt as *King* and *Prophet,* then you muſt grant, that Faith receives the *Perſonal inherent Goſpel Righteouſneſs* for the *Second Juſtification,* before it receives the *imputed legal Righteouſneſs* of Chriſt for your *Firſt Juſtification,* (to uſe your own terms) and ſurely this is to ſet the Cart before the Horſe, and is as odd a thing as if a Lady upon the motion of a Match to a Forreign Prince,

ſhould change her natural allegiance, and become his *Subject*, before ſhe becomes *his Wife*.

3. If by Faith receiving Chriſt as *Prophet* and *Prieſt*, you mean a *Purpoſe* or *Promiſe* [or *Covenant*] to *Subject* your ſelves to him in thoſe Offices, then *our firſt Juſtification is by works of our own, as well as the ſecond*, and you ſhould put in *Works*, and blot out *Faith*, *Rom.* 5. 1. (and where ever elſe you find Juſtification aſcribed to Faith) and if that be *Pauls* ſenſe, you may warrant your *Alteration* better than *Luther* could his *Addition* of the word *alone* to *Faith*, *Rom.* 3. 28. in his verſion of the New Teſtament into his Native Language.

Gal. I think you take our Divines meaning *right*. for they do ſay that *Subjection*, Cordial-covenanting, Self-reſigning are the very *proper eſſential formal Acts of Faith* [*as Juſtifying.*]

Paul. And I think that your Divines take the Apoſtles meaning *wrong*. 1. For that *Juſtifying Faith, as Juſtifying*, lies in an *Acceptance of Chriſt as a Prieſt only*, is evident, becauſe in the Execution of that Office only he performed that Righteouſneſs, by which, imputed to us, we are Juſtified. *Chriſts Sufferings* were undergone

gone as a *Prieſt* and his *Active Obedience* muſt be referred to this *Office* too; as appears, by the *Typical Prieſts*, who were to be *legally Righteous*, and their *Sacrifice* without *blemiſh* (which the Apoſtle alludes to *Heb.* 27. 26. 1 *Pet.* 1. 19.) 2. Hence, *Juſtifying Faith* (ſo called, not from its *only*, but *immediate effect*) does *accept* of Chriſt as *Prophet* and *King*, not for *Juſtification*, but *Sanctification* (*viz.*) Submiſſion to his *Inſtruction* and *Government*. And that *Submiſſion* or *Subjection* to him in thoſe Offices, which you called but now, the *Act*, is indeed the *Effect* of Faith; and in order of Nature *after* the acceptance of Chriſt as *Prieſt* for Juſtification. Hence *Purifying the Heart* is aſcribed to *Faith*, Acts 15. 9. *Not that Faith does purifie us, as a Grace or Quality infuſed into our Souls: but becauſe it receives purity offered in Chriſt*, as *Calvin* well obſerves on that place. And ſo I judge, 'tis evident enough, that *Works* have no cooperation with Faith, to *Juſtification*.

Gal. I wonder at your confidence, in denying Juſtification by works, when the expreſſions of St. *James* are ſo plain, *Jam.* 2. 21, 22, 25.

Paul. And ſo do the *Papiſts* when we deny a *real* (as they term a *Bodily*) *Preſence* of Chriſts, in the Sacrament, when the words of Chriſt are ſo plain, *This is my Body.* But as they, ſo you, have little cauſe to wonder. (as will appear preſently.) But in the mean while, I cannot but admire at your interpretation of *James*, to a ſenſe contrary to *Paul, Rom.* 3. 28. I ſhall tell you how Dr. *Manton* (a Divine of great eſteem with you *Galatians* and us *Pauliſts*) reconciles the ſeeming contradiction between them out of *Diodate* (but in *more conciſe terms*, then he) *Diodate excellently gloſſeth that Juſtification in* Paul, *is oppoſite to the condemnation of a Sinner in general; and Juſtification in* James *is oppoſite to the condemnation of an Hypocrite in particular. In* Pauls *ſenſe a Sinner is abſolved, in* Jame's *ſenſe a Believer is approved, and ſo moſt ſweetly, and for ought I can ſee without exception, the Apoſtles are agreed.* [*Manton* on *James* 2.21. page 312.]

Gal. We have another and better way of reconciling them. That *Paul* when he denieth Juſtification by Works, means *Works of Perfect Obedience*, and *James* when he affirmeth, what *Paul* denies intends by Works, *Goſpel Obedience* which is the

the *Cauſa ſine qua non*, or *Condition* without which we are not juſtified before God.

Paul. The Learned *Manton*, ſhall anſwer, and not I. *So* Socinus [2 Synops *Juſtif. p.* 17.] *and herein he is generally followed by the Men of his own School. But to this I reply.* 1. *That the Apoſtle* Paul *doth not only exclude the exact Obedience of the Law, but the ſincere Obedience of the Goſpel, all kind of Works from the buſineſs of Juſtification*, &c. [*Manton* on *James* 2. 24. *p.* 333. 334.] and elſewhere more fully, *Obedience is not the condition of Juſtification, but the evidence: not the Condition and Qualification of the New Covenant, ſo much as of the Covenanters*, [*Manton* p. 336. on *Jam.* 2. 24.] 2. *'Tis a matter of dangerous conſequence to ſet up works upon any pretence whatſoever, as the matter or condition of our Juſtification before God, for it robbeth God of his Glory*, &c. [*Manton*, v. 24] Read the reſt, it will be worth your while, and let me tell you, my old Friend, that I do not *like* your *Reconciliation* of the *Apoſtles*, nor the *Term*, *Cauſa ſine qua non*, one jot the better for the *Perſons* ſake, of whom your *Maſters* have borrowed them. But though you prefer the *Socinians* interpretation of

James before the *Proteſtants's*, yet do you underſtand this latter?

Gal. Yes, I ſuppoſe their meaning is, that *James* takes *Juſtification* for a *Declaration of it*, and ſo, that *James* intends, that Faith (and conſequently Juſtification) the immediate effect of it) diſcovers its reality by works. But again this interpretation we object.

1. That the *Juſtification* in *James* is ſuch as *Salvation dependeth on*, ver. 14.

Paul. The words are, *What doth it profit, tho' a Man ſay he hath Faith, and hath not Works? can Faith ſave him?* To your Exception, I Anſwer. 1. The Apoſtle ſpeaketh not a word in that Verſe of *Juſtification*, which Salvation *dependeth on*: but of a *Faith* which Salvation *dependeth not on*, (and conſequently nor *Juſtification* (for that *Faith* which will not *ſave*, will not *juſtifie* him that hath it.) 2. Suppoſe other Verſes in the context ſpeak of ſuch a *Juſtification*, yet they do not ſpeak of it *Directly*, but *Indirectly*; and by *conſequence* (according to our interpretation of *James*) we mean, that his Scope is to prove, that that Man is not a *Viſible Believer*, (and ſo nor *Viſibly Juſtified*) that hath no *Works*, and hence indeed it follows, that much leſs, *is he* an

Invi-

Invisible Believer, and so *Justified in the Court of Heaven* (and so in a state of *Salvation*.)

Gal. 2. We Object, That the Justification in *James* is such as *followeth* only a *Living Faith*. But the World may as well justifie us, when we have no *Faith* at all.

Paul. I suppose your Objection refers to *Jam.* 2. 17. 26. and I Answer.

1. Those Verses (if understood of a *Justification before God*) do not affirm such a Justification by a *Living Faith*, but only deny it to a *Dead Faith*.

2. As to the latter Clause, which seems to *aim* at a *Reason*, why *James Justification* cannot be *Declarative* [or *before Men*] I *Reply*, that if Men will be *wilful*, they may as well *condemn* us, when we *have Faith*, as a self-conceited Man may bear us in hand that a *Man is dead*, when he hath all the *Signs of Life*, as well as that he is *alive*, when there is no *Sign at all of Life*. But what then? Does it therefore follow, that Works are no ground for a Judgment of Mens Faith, and so of their Justification? No surely; And even he that makes this Objection, does yet (out of the heat of dispute) confess, That *Works do prove the Sincerity of our Faith*,

Faith, [Read *Matthew* 5. 16. 1 *Peter* 2. 12.]

Gal. 3. We ask; Was *Abraham* Juſtified before Men for a *Secret Action*? [*James* 2. 21. compared with *Geneſis* 22. 5.]

Paul. 1. *Iſaac* was witneſs of his Fathers attempt to kill him, *Gen.* 22. 9, 10. and ſo *Abraham* was *declared* to be a Believer (and ſo Juſtified) *before one Man.*

2. Though the Action was ſecret when done; yet when it came to *Mens knowledge*, it was an *Evidence* of *Abrahams* Faith; and ſo of his *Juſtification*, to all that heard and credited the report of the fact. And now it is recorded in the Scripture, it is a ſtanding Juſtification of his Faith to all that read and believe the Hiſtory. *Chriſt is declared to be the Son of God by the Reſurrection*, Rom. 1. 4. and yet his *Reſurrection* was a *Secret Action*, even to the Diſciples, who ſaw him after he was *Riſen*, but did not ſee him *Riſe*, *Mark* 16. 9, 15. and I hope that the Diſciple frequent ſight of him, was to them and our belief of their report to us, a ſufficient ground to credit the Fact, and ſo a Declaration to us of his being the Son of God, and of his Juſtification from the Sins of the elect charged upon him in his Death.

Gal.

Gal. But was *Abraham* Juſtified before Men for ſuch an Action as killing his Son? [Would they not rather exclaim againſt it, as a barbarous Action?]

Paul. Perhaps ſome Men might, who did not know he had a Command from God. But upon ſuppoſition, that his Action was known to be warranted by God (to whom alone we owe an *implicit Faith*, a *Blind Obedience*) his Faith muſt needs be celebrated, (as it is, *Heb.* 11. 17.) for that very act.

Gal. But was not *He* the *Juſtifier* here, who was the *Imputer* of Righteouſneſs? *ver.* 23. therefore God was the *Juſtifier* here.

Paul. According to this interpretation now under debate, we Anſwer this Queſtion in the *Negative*: All that can be fairly collected from *ver.* 23. and *ver.* 21. compared, is but this; that *Abraham*'s offering up his Son was a *New evidence* of his *Old Faith*, and of *Gods imputing Righteouſneſs to him long before*, Gen. 15. 16. If we ſhould grant you the *Affirmative*, then this abſurdity would follow (ſuppoſing the term *Fulfilled*, ver. 23. be meant (as a *Galatian* Divine interprets it) that *That Teſtimony of Scripture appeared to be true*) that *Gods Juſtifying* Abraham *by Faith formerly*,

formerly, ſhould *appear to be true, by Gods Juſtifying him by Works now.* A ſtrange proof ſurely.

Gal. Your Phraſe, That *Works juſtifies our Faith, not our Perſons*, makes *ver.* 24. run thus ſenceleſly by Works a Mans Faith is Juſtified, and not by Faith only.

Paul. No ſuch matter; the ſenſe is good thus. A Man is *declared* to be *Juſtified* by Works, and not by *Faith without them*; becauſe Faith is *viſible* only by *Works* [ſee *v.* 18.] Thus much may ſuffice, to evince; that this *Interpretation* of *James* may be defended againſt any Objections of your Party. Yet there is another Interpretation, which deſerves conſideration. This grants one thing which you contend for, that *James* ſpeaks of *Juſtification before God:* but *denies* another, (*viz.*) that *James* affirms ſuch Juſtification to be by Works. In ſhort, when *James* ſays, *by Works a Man is Juſtified*; he means a *Working Faith.* [a Faith apt to ſhew it ſelf in all good Works (*Works* the *Effect* being put for *Faith*, their *Cauſe*] And when *James* adds, and *not by Faith only*, he excludes *a dead Faith*, a bare aſcent to the *Articles of Religion, deſtitute of ſincere Obedience, and ſo* Paul *and* James

do

do ſweetly conſort together. Paul *ſevers Works from our Juſtification, not from our Faith,* James *joyns Works to our Faith, but not to our Juſtification.* [ſo *Pemble* of *Juſtification,* p. 234.]

Gal. We ſay, we dare not raiſe an Expoſition, ſo far from the plain importance of the words, without apparent neceſſity, which here is not.

Paul. 1. Whether the Expoſition be *forced,* you cannot well judge without reading *Pemble,* which I deſire you will do with attention.

2. There is an *Apparent neceſſity,* either of this *Expoſition,* or the *former* of *Declarative Juſtification:* becauſe elſe the *Apoſtles* claſh one with another.

Gal. If *Pemble* ſo underſtand a *Working Faith,* as that it juſtifieth *principally as Faith*; and leſs *principally,* as *Working,* we ſhould not differ from him.

Paul. How Faith ſhould juſtifie *Principally,* I cannot conceive, according to your own Notion, that Faith juſtifies in the *neareſt ſenſe,* directly and properly, as it is the fulfilling of the condition of the New Covenant. In the *remote* and *more improper ſenſe,* as it is. *The receiving of Chriſt, and his ſatisfactory Righteouſneſs* ſo that you deny that which is *Peculiar*

to

to faith as oppoſed to Works in Juſtification, and which gives it a *Principality* above them: and you aſcribe no more *to it*, then what agrees alſo to *Works*. For your Divines ſay, That *Works juſtifie in the ſame kind of cauſality, or procurement as Faith*, (viz.) *as part of the condition of the Covenant*, or of Juſtification. Theſe Notions are *Ropes of Sand*, but (if I miſtake not) you have a *Notion* that *aſcribes more to Works, than to Faith*, which I cannot readily recal. Pray help my memory.

Gal. It is *this* (I ſuppoſe,) *Works make Faith alive as to the attainment if its end of Juſtification.*

Paul. Yes, that is it. And if it be true, than ſurely it roundly follows, that *Works juſtifie principally, as Works*; and *Faith juſtifies leſs principally, as Faith* (to invert your own *Phraſeology*) and ſo contradict your ſelves.

Gal. But does not the Scripture often aſcribe *Juſtification* at the *Day of Judgment* to Works, at *Matth.* 12. 37. chap. 25. 35. *&c.*

Paul. This general Anſwer might ſuffice, that however the *letter* of the *Words* in thoſe places *ſound*, it having been proved, that our *conſtitutive Juſtification* (as your

your Phraſe is) is not by *Works*, our *ſententiall* Juſtification *cannot be by them* neither; *For the laſt Judgment ſhall be nothing elſe, than the approbation of the Doctrine of the Goſpel*, [ſays *Calvin* on *John* 12. 48.] which Doctrine is; that we are juſtified by Faith, not by Works. Yet I Anſwer, to the *firſt Scripture*, Chriſt meaning can be no more, than that *Good Words* ſhall be a *Proof* or *Evidence* of our *right to ſententiall Juſtification*; not that they ſhall be the *condition of our right to it*. It is more agreeable to Scripture language to ſay, that Chriſt in pronouncing Sentence of Juſtification, will have reſpect to the *Words* for the *Speakers* ſake, not to the Speaker for the *Words* ſake; for 'tis ſaid, *Gen.* 4. 4. God had reſpect to *Abel* the Offerer, and thence to his Offering, not to the Offering, and thence to the Offerer.

Gal. But Chriſt at the Great day will ſhow forth his *Love to the Obedience*, and not only to the Perſons Juſtified.

Paul. We grant it two ways. 1. By Praiſe and Commendation, 1 *Cor.* 4. 5. and by giving that Teſtimony to their *Words*, the Obedience now under conſideration) which he did to *Job* in this life, (*viz.* that they were *right*, *Job* 42. 8.

(but

(but with ſome graines of allowance, for many of his words had been very *wrong*) And 2. *By putting them into poſſeſſion of that Salvation*, which their Obedience *qualified or made them meet for*, [*Col.* 1. 12. *Pſal.* 17. *ult.*] not gave them *right* to.

Gal. But our Works gives us a right *now* to Salvation, and therefore will do ſo, at *the day of* Judgment. A ſtanch Divine of our Party, thus interprets *Rev.* 22. 14. Bleſſed are they that do his Commandments, that they may have *Right* [*by Vertue of the Covenat of Grace*] to the Tree of Life [*Chriſt and Eternal Life by and with him.*]

Paul. If your Annotators gloſs be right, I cannot ſee to the contrary, but that *Faith* is *ſhut out for a Wrangler*, from being the *bond* of Union on our part between us and Chriſt. For *Works* are competent enough for that end *without it*. And if this be true, I cannot think but *Paul* and *John* are at *Daggers drawing*. For whereas *Paul* ſays, that Chriſt dwells in our hearts by *Faith*, *John* ſays, that he dwells in them by *Works*.

Gal. Does not *John* ſay elſewhere. He that keepeth his Commandments dwelleth in him, and he in him, 1 *John* 3. 24?

Paul.

Paul. Your Annotatour's gloſs *here* contradicts his *other* now mentioned. 'Tis this, [*thereby ſhewing himſelf to be united to Chriſt*] And ſo we Anſwer, that *doing God's Commandments*, does not *give*, but *declare a right* to Chriſt, and eternal life. And ſo to that *Sentential Juſtification* (now under debate) whereby that life is awarded to us. But the right accrues from our Union to Chriſt by Faith alone, whereby all things [that are Chriſt's are *ours*, 1 *Cor.* 3. 21, 23. And let me add, that if *Chriſt* be intended in that metaphor, *The Tree of Life.* 'Tis not Chriſt as *offered* in the Goſpel, but Chriſt as *enjoyed* in Heaven; which enjoyment is intimated in the word *come* in the ſentence of Abſolution, *Matth.* 25. 34, 35. from which Scripture I would fain know what you do infer.

Gal. This we infer from thence, that the Works of Mercy there mentioned, are parts of the Evangelical Righteouſneſs, which is the condition of our Juſtification at the day of Judgment. The word *For* importing the *Reaſon* of the *Sentence.*

Paul. If that be a juſt Inference, theſe *Abſurdities* would follow.

1. That theſe Works of Evangelical Righteouſneſs *foreſeen*, were the condition of Election [as that *term* imports, a *choice* of ſome Perſons, with a leaving of others; and a *purpoſe* of beſtowing Salvation upon them; both being intended in thoſe clauſes of the Sentence, *Ye Bleſſed of my Father, the Kingdom prepared for you*, ver. 34.] And thus muſt the Sentence run. *I admit you into poſſeſſion of Salvation, becauſe ye have performed works of Mercy to my poor Members, the foreſight whereof induced my Father from eternity to appoint you to Salvation, rather than others whom he foreſaw would neglect thoſe Works.*

2. Abſurdity, Is that thoſe Works are alſo the condition of Adoption [intimated in the Word *inherit*] and this *Adoption* may be conſidered, either as included in *Election* [as explained above] from eternity; or as an act of God's in time. If the *former*, then this clauſe muſt be added to the ſentence. *And becauſe my Father foreknew you would be dutiful, he reſolved to adopt you to a Kingdom; whileſt he denied that honour to thoſe whom he foreknew would be undutiful and rebellious.* If the *latter*, the ſentence muſt have this addition, *Becauſe ye have performed thoſe good Works which were the condition of your Adoption;*

Adoption: Therefore I adjudge you the poſſeſſion of the Inheritance you were thereby adopted to.

Gal. But we do not hold Works forſeen to be the cauſe of Election, and Adoption included in it.

Paul. Nor do I charge you with that Aſſertion. I only deſign your conviction of the errour of your *Interpretation* of the Text, from whence ſuch Abſurdities do naturally flow. But ſurely you cannot deny, that *Works* are the *condition* of *actual Adoption*, if they be the condition or matter of *Juſtification*: whereas the Scripture ſays, *We are all the Children of God by Faith in Chriſt Jeſus*, Gal. 3. 26. By *Faith*, not by *Works*; not Children, becauſe dutiful; but dutiful becauſe Children.

Gal. But if Works of Mercy be not conſidered as part of the condition of Juſtification at the day of Judgment; how then? Not as the Righteouſneſs which the Law requires. For ſo *ſhall no Man living be Juſtified*, Rom. 3. 20.

Paul. Thoſe Works cannot be conſidered otherwiſe than as part of the Righteouſneſs which the Law requires, if they be part of the condition of Juſtification; and therefore are excluded from being

by the Scripture you cite (as hath been ſufficiently demonſtrated)

Gal. Works are not conſidered, as a meer ſign whereby God doth diſcern Mens Faith, for he ſeeth it immediately, and needeth no ſign.

Paul. The *Man* Chriſt Jeſus being the *Judge*, *Acts* 17. 31. he will ſuitably to his manhood, at the great Day, paſs Sentence upon believers by *Works*, as *ſigns* of their Faith, *to himſelf*, (as he did on Earth to the Centurian, *Mat.* 8. 10. and the Woman of *Canaan*, chap. 15. 28.) though as *God*, upon an immediate inſpection of their hearts, he had admitted their Souls into Heaven at their diſſolution.

Gal. Nor are Works produced as meer ſigns to ſatisfie the juſtified Perſon himſelf.

Paul. Yet the Author whom you quote, adds, *That the buſineſs of the Day of Judgment, is to put the godly out of doubt by the ſentance, and by their Glory, put out of doubt:* Of what? It muſt be either of their *Sincerity*, or the *paſſing of the Sentance of Abſolution*, or their *Admiſſion into Glory* of their whole Perſons. The *firſt* he denies; and I think, he might as reaſonably deny the other *too*. For it is

not

not imaginable, that the Godly who had been abſolved, and admitted into Heaven in *Soul*, ſhould doubt of the continuance of that favour, or of the extent of it to *their Bodies*.

Gal. But the common opinion is, that it is to ſatisfie the condemned World of the ſincerity of the Faith of the Godly.

Paul. Add but the end of that ſatisfaction, (*viz.*) that the Wicked may be convinced of the Juſtice of God's procedure, in acquitting the Godly; whilſt themſelves are condemned, and we own the *Opinion*, and like it never the worſe for the *commonneſs* of it. What have you to except againſt it?

Gal. For, clearly expreſſes the ground or reaſon of the Sentence. Can any *more* be ſaid of Faith, than that we are Juſtified or Judged to life *for it*?

Paul. To Anſwer your Queſtion firſt. *So much* is no where ſaid of *Faith*, and therefore much leſs of *Works*.

As for your Particle; for I cannot ſee how it ſhould expreſs the *Ground* of the *Sentence*; becauſe the Works of Mercy mentioned in it, are no *Righteouſneſs*, as not being conformable to any Law. If they be, tell me to which?

Gal. To deal ingeniouſly with you, I cannot well tell to which. If I ſhall ſay, to the *Natural Law*, I am aware, that the ſame Arguments, whereby we exclude *Faith* and *Repentance* from being branches of that Law, exclude *Mercy* alſo. If I ſhall ſay, to the *Moral Law*, I am ſenſible, that that requires perfect Obedience. And if the *Acts of Mercy* in the Sentence are *ſuch*, then they are our *Legal*, not *Evangelical Righteouſneſs* (which latter we contend for) but if they are Acts of *Sincere Obedience*, then they fall ſhort of what the Moral Law requires; and ſo cannot be our *Legal Righteouſneſs*. And therefore I muſt ſay, that the Acts of Mercy under conſideration, are conformable to the *Goſpel Law*.

Paul. I am very glad, my Diſcourſe hath had ſo good an effect, as to give you the ſight of Day, through a little hole. But as to that Law you pitch upon, I Argue (upon *Suppoſition*, not a *Grant* that there is ſuch a *Law*) either that Law requires *Perfect*, or only *Sincere* Obedience. If the *former*, none can be Juſtified by that Law without *ſuch* Obedience: But the Works of Mercy in the Sentence, were not perfect. *Solomon* ſays, *There is not a juſt Man upon Earth that doth good, and ſinneth*

ſinneth not, Eccleſ. 7. 20. *i. e.* that doth not evil, as well as good, and that doth not evil in doing good. If the *latter*, then indeed the *Merciful* may be ſentenced to Life, as having fulfilled the Righteouſneſs of that *Law*. But then there are *two ſcurvy conſequences* will undeniably follow. *One*, That Chriſt's *Sentence of Juſtification*, doth not include *Forgiveneſs of Sin*. For if *Sincerity* be all the *Goſpel Law requires*, where *that* is found, there is no tranſgreſſion, and ſo no need of forgiveneſs. But your Party agree with ours in acknowledging *Forgiveneſs*, to be a branch of Juſtification, by warrant from, *Acts* 3. 19. *The other Conſequence*, which follows from the *firſt* is, that it is a ſentence of *Meer Legal Juſtification*, which Chriſt pronounces at the day of Judgment. For Chriſt pronounces Men Righteous, becauſe they have done all, that the *Goſpel Law* exacted of them.

Gal. The uſe and intereſt of Goſpel conditions, is not from the Conformity of them to the *Preceptive part* of the Law (though in a degree) there be that, but from their conformity to the *Rule* of the grace of the *Promiſe*.

Paul. 1. But then the ſame [illegible] returns, (*viz.*) That Men [illegible]

Righteous, without a Righteouſneſs. For *Chriſt* by vertue of the Goſpel-Sanction accepts them as Righteous by that very *Law*, which they have broken, and by that breach are *Unrighteous*: And ſo the Judgment cannot be ſaid to be *according to Truth.*

2. I would have you conſider, that *Righteouſneſs* imports a reſpect or *Relation* to a *Law* or Rule of our Actions, not to a *Sanction.* The Sanction of Promiſe, *ſuppoſes* actions to be *good*, does not make them good, we are not Righteous we are juſtified; but Juſtified becauſe we are Righteous. And this is evident from the inſtance of the Old Covenant of Works. *God made Man upright* [or Righteous] *Eccleſ. 7. ult.* which he did in *Order* of *Nature*, if not *Time*, before he annexed that Sanction to the Law, *The Man that doth them ſhall live in them*, Gal. 3. 12.

Gal. It *ſeemeth* that Chriſt doth call Men *Righteous*, in reference to this perſonal Evangelical Righteouſneſs mentioned in their juſtifying Sentence, *Matth.* 25. 46.

Paul. But it ſeemeth not ſo to me. For *Believers are acquitted at the day of Judgment, on the very ſame account and ſcoure they are now* (viz) *for the imputed Righteouſneſs*

ouſneſs of Chriſt in the way of free grace, [or received by Faith] [ſo *Flavel* on Aſſem. Catech. *p.* 97, 96. *Q.* 7. 1 compared] and ſo the denomination of *Righteous*, muſt needs be taken from that Righteouſneſs without them upon the account whereof they were acquitted.

Gal. I am ſenſible, that our Cauſe ſuffers by my diſability to manage it. Yet the Interpretation our Divines give of the kinds of works excluded from Juſtification ſticks with me.

Paul. Let me hear it, and I will give you my ſentiment about it.

Gal. The Work excluded from being the Righteouſneſs whereby we are juſtified, are the *Works* of the *Ceremonial Law*, [*Rom.* 4. 9, 10. *Gal.* 5. 2.]

Paul. Let Judicious *Calvin* be heard, who thus occurs this Objection. *'Tis certain that* Paul *conteſted with falſe Teachers, who puffed up the People with an undue confidence in the Ceremonial Law. But in deviſion of the controverſie between himſelf and them, he limits not his Diſcourſe to the Ceremonies; nor does he diſpute particularly, how far they availed; but he comprehends the whole Law* [Rom. 3. 20.] *Calvins* meaning is, that the Apoſtle argues from an *Univerſal* to *particulars*, *i. e.* that Men are not

not Juſtified by any *Works*; therefore not by thoſe of the *Ceremonial Law*, and that this Obſervation is true, and ſo gives a *Mortal wound* to your cauſe, I ſhall make moſt evident.

1. The *falſe Teachers* looked for *Juſtification by Works of the Moral Law*, as well as the *Ceremonial*, *Luk.* 18. 11, 12. The *Phariſee* boaſted of his freedom from Sins againſt *that Law*, and *truſted in himſelf that he was Righteous* thereby, *v.* 9. and therefore the *Apoſtles* Aſſertion, that by *the deeds of the Law there ſhall no fleſh be juſtified in Gods ſight*, Rom. 3. 20. muſt needs be extended to the *Moral Law*.

2. The *Apoſtle* excludes from Juſtification the Works of that *Law* which was *common to Jew and Gentile*, which was the *Natural or Moral Law*; as appears by the inſtances of the *Sins* which were all againſt *that Law*, and not one againſt the *Ceremonial Law*, Rom. 3. 20. compared with *v.* 10. to *v.* 18.

3. The Apoſtle *excludes* the *Works* of that *Law* which the *Goſpel intended to eſtabliſh*, as a rule of duty, *Rom.* 3. laſt. which was not the *Ceremonial Law*, [Eph. 2. 15. Heb. 9 10.] but the *Moral* [*Mat.* 5. 17. 18. compared with *v.* 21. 22, 27, 28.]

Gal. But your *Calvin* takes in the *Ceremonial*

monial Law too, as eſtabliſhed by the Doctrine of Juſtification *without the deeds of the Law* [Calv. *Rom.* 3. *ult.*

Paul. He does ſo; but with a *difference* from the Moral: *Not that the precepts of it are continued, but that the righteouſneſs ſhadowed out by them, was exhibited in Chriſt.*

But as for the *Moral Law* (he ſays) *that in it is found the exact righteouſneſs of the Law, which by imputation is made ours; and alſo ſanctification, imperfect indeed, but aiming at Perfection as its mark* [*Calvin* on *Rom.* 3. laſt.] and ſo he intimates, that the Moral Law requires *perfect Obedience* ſtill, though not *for Juſtification*: And ſo God does not ceaſe to be a *Sovereign*, by becoming a *Benefactor*. Again, by your denial of Juſtification to work of the Ceremonial Law you contradict your own Notions.

1. *That Works done by Grace do juſtifie*, for the *Works of the Ceremonial Law* whilſt it was in force, were *Works done by Grace*, and ſo according to your ſentiment were part of the Righteouſneſs, whereby the Believers of the Old Teſtament (and of the New too, till that Law was actually aboliſhed) were juſtified. This *Antecedent* I prove. 1. From *Luk.* 1. 6. which *Zacharias* and *Elizabeth*, are called, *Righteous*; *becauſe*

becauſe they walked in the Ordinances of the Lord, which term notes the *Ceremonial Law*. And 2. *By this Reaſon*, that they had this *Moral Goodneſs* in them, (*viz.*) a ſubjection of the Conſcience to the meer will of the Law-giver; and if Works done by Grace under the *Old Teſtament Diſpenſation* did not juſtifie: How come they by that efficacy under the *New?*

2. *That the works of the Goſpel Law juſtifie.* For the works of the Ceremonial Law were works of the *New Goſpel Law*; (in your ſenſe is) the actual obligation to that Law commenced ſoon after *Adam*'s fall, (as we may collect from *Gen.* 4. 3. 4.) and that Law repreſented Chriſt and his benefits, and the obſervation of it was an exerciſe of *Faith and Repentance* (*the two great precepts of your Goſpepl Law*) [as appears by 1 *Cor.* 5. 7, 8.] and either *thoſe Works* of the New Goſpel Law, did not *juſtifie* under that *Evangelical Diſpenſation before Chriſt.* And if ſo, how is it that any Goſpel *Works* do juſtifie *Since Chriſt?* Or if thoſe Ceremonial Works did juſtifie then, and not now; then the Old Teſtament Saints were juſtified by one, the New Teſtament Saints by another ſort of works of the ſame Goſpel Law.

3. You

3. You grant that we are Juſtified *by Works of the Moral Law*; but the works of the *Ceremonial Law* were *Works of the Moral Law* [i. e. *poſitive Precepts*, which by vertue of the firſt and ſecond Commandments of the Moral Law, the *Jews* were Obliged to obey; and this is true, whether you conſider them as joyned with their *ſignification*, and Goſpel uſe, or *ſeperated there from*, and being thus coincident, the *Jews could not be juſtified by the Moral Law, but they muſt be juſtified by the Ceremonial Law*; And if it was ſo then, why not now? *The Reaſon* cannot be becauſe 'tis a *Law of that kind*, but becauſe we are not juſtified by any *Law at all*.

Gal. This is all *Stuff*, we deny Juſtification by the Moral Law.

Paul. I ſee, 'tis as true of *erronious Perſons* as of *Liars*, that *they have need of good memories*, to make their tales hang well together. Do not you *Galatians* alledg *Abraham* and *Rahab* as inſtances of Perſons *juſtified by Works*, *Jam.* 2. 21. 25. And 'tis evident that *Rahabs* receiving *Joſhua's* Meſſengers was an Act of *Obedience to that Moral Law*. *Be not forgetful to entertain Strangers*, Heb. 13. 2. (which is a branch of the ſixth Commandment) and

and *Abrahams* offering up his Son, was though a positive Precept, yet reducible to the sum of the first Table, *Mat.* 22. 37, 38. *Thou shalt love the Lord thy God*, &c. And God himself owns it as a sign and effect of his *fear of him*, *Gen.* 22. 12. and surely *fear* of God is a duty of the *Moral Law*, (*viz.*) [of the first Commandment] and did not you even now make *Love and its Works* the personal Righteousness whereby we are justified, and Love is the sum of both Tables of the Moral Law, *Love to God* (in the Scripture now quoted) *Love to our Neighbour*, *Matth.* 22. 39, 40. and *Rom.* 13. 8, 9.

Gal. But you forget what I told you, that it is *sincere* Obedience (which the Gospel requires) not *perfect* (which the Law exacts) that is our personal Righteousness to Justification.

Paul. I remember it well enough, and thence rightly conclude, that you say and unsay, when you deny, that you hold Justification by the Moral Law. For the *sincere Obedience* which you call a *Work* of the *Gospel Law*, and the *perfect Obedience* which you call a *Work of the Moral Law*, are really *Works of the same Law* (*viz.*) the *Moral*: As your Wife is the same Woman now, that she was when

when ſingle, though ſhe hath loſt her Fathers Name, and got her Husbands. As for your *evaſion*, that 'tis *Perfect Obedience* which is excluded from being our *Perſonal Righteouſneſs for Juſtification*; it is inſignificant, yea hurtful to your cauſe: Let us but weigh that one paſſage, *Rom.* 3.20. *By the deeds of the Law ſhall no fleſh be juſtified in his ſight; for by the Law is the knowledge of ſin.* Where remember, that by *no fleſh*, is meant, *no Man*, [*Jew or Gentile*, ver. 9.] and that by the *Law*, is meant the *Law Natural* [or unwritten] and the *Law Moral* [or written] (which are the ſame for ſubſtance (as I have proved before) and that by the *Knowledge of Sin*, (which is by the Law,) is meant (in *James*'s Phraſe) *being convinced of the Law as Tranſgreſſors*, Jam. 2. 9. and then borrowing his Phraſe, the Apoſtles Argumens is this, they who are convinced of the Law as tranſgreſſours, ſhall not be Juſtified by the deeds of the Law: But *Jew* and *Gentile* are convinced of the Law as Tranſgreſſours. Therefore neither *Jew* nor *Gentile* ſhall be juſtified by the deeds of the Law. And thence the inference is very natural, that (at leaſt) *all the deeds of your Goſpel Law* (*viz.*) Love with all its works] which you own to be deeds

of

of the Moral Law, and imperfect) *are excluded from being our perſonal Righteouſneſs for Juſtification.* And if you acknowledg not the *Inference*, you accuſe the *Apoſtle* of great fault in a *Diſputant* (*viz.*) not to be aware of the force of his own Argument, that it would *prove* what he intended not; or rather, *diſprove* what he intended to *grant* (as you imagine) I mean, that *we are Juſtified by ſincere or imperfect works, becauſe we are juſtified only by perfect works.*

Gal. Some of our Party alledge that *External Works* of the *Moral Law*, not *internal*, are denied to be our Righteouſneſs for Juſtification, and thus a Learned Man argues, ſo far forth as *Paul* rejects Spiritual and External Works, as unneceſſary; he admits of internal Works as neceſſary, but ritual Works *Paul* rejects as unneceſſary to Juſtification; therefore he admits Spiritual Works, as neceſſary to Juſtification.

Paul. I ſhall borrow the Learned Dr. *Tullies*, Anſwer to it (who deſerves an Honourable mention for appearing on the behalf of Pauline Juſtification againſt its oppoſers) *A pleaſant argumentation* (ſaith he) *and very like this, ſo far forth as uſeleſs Subjects are excluded, uſeful Subjects are*

are admitted: but uſeleſs Subjects are excluded from a ſhare in Regal Authority; therefore uſeful Subjects are admitted to a ſhare in it, whereas both ſort of Subjects are excluded. [Tullies *Juſtificatio Paulina*, pag. 57. 58.] And I may make bold to add, that the reaſon is; becauſe not ſubjects as *uſeleſs*, but meerly as *Subjects* are debarred Regal Authority; and ſo Works are not rejected from Juſtification as *External*, but *as Works* (though they be *Internal* and *Spiritual*.)

Gal. But ſome of our perſwaſion conceive, that the Works which are denied to juſtifie, are Works done without the aſſiſtance of Divine Grace [or Works done by our own ſtrength.]

Paul. If they mean *excluſively* (as they muſt, or elſe ſpeak not to the Queſtion) I ſee no reaſon for their Opinion. For it hath been proved ſufficiently, that *Works done by Grace* are not allowed by our *Patron Paul*, to have any thing to do in Juſtification (except as *Signs* or *Effects* of it) and thence it follows indeed, that much leſs can he be ſuppoſed to allow any thing *to Works done without Grace.* But if *Paul* intended directly to exclude from Juſtification Works done without Grace, he would have fitted his *inſtances to his Poſition*, and have brought in *Cain* and *Judas*,

rather than *David* and *Abraham* for examples of Persons not Justified by the Works he disputed of. But seeing he does otherwise, I cannot but have a better conceit of his *Logick*, who was brought up at the feet of *Gamaliel* then of your Divines, who were brought up at the feet of *Amyraldus*.

Gal. Once more some of our Party conceive, that the *Apostle* intends only to exclude from Justification, those Works, which the Workmen thought to be Meritorious.

Paul. I Answer, 1. That according to their own explication of their Notion, it follows, that *Paul* intended to exclude *all works*, even those of the *Gospel Law*; and if you will own the consequence, we will shake hands, and be perfect Friends.

Gal. I do not apprehend what explication you interpret *a giving up our cause*.

Paul. 'Tis this, That the Objectors confess, *That Christians are prone to place merit in their Faith and Obedience to the Gospel, and that when they do so, their faith and Obedience are by Analogy included in, and refuted by the Apostles discourse* (viz.) [*as not being the righteousness by which they are justified.*]

But 2. I deny, that the Apostle intended to exclude *only*, *Works imagined to be meritorious*, and affirm, that because of the pronenes

proneſs of fallen Man to place Merit in Works. God to make ſure work excludes *all works of our own* from being the *condition* or *matter* of our *Juſtification*, and aſcribes this *Effect*, only to the Work of another (*viz.*) *Chriſt*, and ſo there's no pretence for the merit excondigno (as the Popiſh term is) for the *intrinſick value* of the works is from the *Worthineſs* of another *Subject* and *Agent*, nor *ex pacto*, for there is not ſo much as a *promiſe* or *contract of God's to juſtifie us, by any Righteouſneſs in us or done by us.*

Gal. But doth not your Doctrine in denying good Works to be the condition of our Juſtification tend to drive Obedience out of the World?

Paul. 1. I dare appeal to your own experience, whether this Doctrine hath had any ſuch effect upon the *Puritans* in our time who were ſtanch *Pauliſts.*

2. I apprehend not the tendency of it to that end, unleſs you ſuppoſe good Works to be of no other uſe, than to juſtifie us. And if that be your ſentiment, take an Anſwer to it from a Pious Learned Divine of *New-England.* Obj. *Good Works are uſeleſs, if they be not for Juſtification.* Sol. *There are uſes and neceſſary uſes for our good Works,* Tit. 3. 14. *Though they ſerve not for our Juſtification. To ſay otherwiſe, is as if a Man ſhould ſay, What uſe of Money, if I*

cannot eat it? and of my House, if I cannot carry it about? for I can buy Meat with my Money, and dwell in my House. [Chauncy *of Justification*, pag. 216.]

Gal. But your Author does not name the *uses.*

Paul. But I can easily supply that defect. They are, *an Acknowledgment* of Gods *Soveraignty*; that we cease not to be *Creatures*, by being made *New Creatures, an Expression* of our *Gratitude* to our *Benefactor*, 1 Cor. 6. last, *A shewing forth of Gods Praises*, 1 Pet. 2. 9. or *Vertues* ἀρετὰς (as I am told the Greek is) *i. e.* the Divine Perfections, Justice, Goodness, Truth, *&c.* For which *God is worthy to be Praised* [*Psal.* 18. 3.] by our imitation of them.

Gal. But surely *Good works are necessary to Justification and Salvation?*

Paul. Many Learned Men think it not safe to use such a *Proposition.* But rather this, *Good Works are necessary to justified Persons, or to those that shall be saved.*

Gal. I think they are more *Nice* than *Wise.* What's the difference between those two Propositions.

Paul. The *Former* makes good works *conditions effecting* Justification. *The Latter* makes them Offices and *Duties* in the Persons justified. [*An. Burgesse.* Vind, Leg. p. 40.]

Gal. Doth not your Doctrine confirm the World

World in their Soul cozening Faith, in taking Christ for a *Saviour*, and not for a *Lord?* Surely the easiness of the *former*, and difficulty of the *Latter* seemeth to tell us, that this is a necessary part of Justifying Faith.

Paul. To your Question, I Answer, Negatively; but you misrepresent our Doctrine. Have not I argued with you sufficiently about it, and showed you that taking Christ for our Lord is an act of Justifying Faith, though not as *Justifying*, *i. e.* that the same Faith that accepts of Christ for *Justification*, accepts him also for *Sanctification*; but yet, that latter acceptance is not the condition of our Justification, *&c.* As for your talk of the *easiness* of taking Christ for a *Saviour*, if my long acquaintance with you, gave not ground to judge you a good Christian, I should much suspect your state for such words. For surely the heart of Man is as much averse from Justification by the Righteousness of Christ, as a Tradesman who hath been long set up for himself, is to serve an Apprentiship. [read *Rom.* 10. 3.] But I suppose your meaning is, that because we allow not a *purpose* of submitting to Christs Laws, nor an *actual Submission* to be the *Condition* of our Justification; therefore our Doctrine incourages Men to look for Happiness

without Holineſs. But I Anſwer, that there is no ground from *it*, for ſuch incouragement, for we conſtantly affirm, that Sanctification is inſeparable from Juſtification, and though it gives not a *right*, yet it does a *fitneſs* for Heaven; the main happineſs thereof lying in mutual Communion between God and us, there can be no *liking* between God and us, unleſs there be a *likeneſs* between us.

Gal. Is not this excluding of ſincere Obedience from Juſtification the great ſtumbling block of *Papiſts*?

Paul. Are you thereabouts, my Old Friend? It ſeems then you *Symbolize* with *them*, how elſe does *your Doctrine* remove the ſtumbling block, which *ours* puts in their way? And indeed *you* make the *Goſpel* a Law with threats? So *they*. Your Arguments for the *conditionality*, are all the ſame with theirs, for the *merit* of *Goſpel Works* in Juſtification.

Gal. But there is a *wide* difference between conditionality and merit.

Paul. We will talk of that by and by. In the mean while, I muſt tell you, that it is very lucky that your *Arguments* ſhould be the *ſame*, and yet your *Doctrine different*.

Gal. But there is a geat deal of difference between our Doctrine and the Popiſh. For they take *Juſtifying* for *Sanctifying*, but ſo do not we.

Paul.

Paul. Though you do not confound the *Terms*, yet you do, the *things* ſignified by them. I mean, you make Works the *matter* of *Juſtification* and *Sanctification*.

Gal. They overthrow the moſt real difference between the Old Covenant, & the New, and make them in a manner all one.

Paul. The moſt real difference between thoſe two Covenants, I take to be, that in the *former* our Juſtification was by *perſonal righteouſneſs*; in the *latter* by *righteouſneſs of another* imputed to us. And though ye do own [after a ſort,] *imputed Righteouſneſs*, yet by introducing a *perſonal Righteouſneſs for Juſtification*, ye *do in a manner make the two Covenants one*, as well as the Papiſts. For if this *latter* righteouſneſs can obtain the end you aſſign it, the *former* is uſeleſs as to that end.

Gal. But when they ſay, we are juſtified by Works of the Goſpel; they mean only that we are Sanctified by works that follow Faith.

Paul. If that be their only meaning, they are ſounder than you. For then, they do not own *Juſtification* by Works of the Goſpel, as you do.

Gal. The Papiſts take our Works to be part of our *Legal Righteouſneſs*; we take them not to be the ſmaleſt portion of it; but only a part of our *Evangelical Righteouſneſs*,

ouſneſs, or of the condition upon which Chriſts Righteouſneſs ſhall be ours.

Paul. 1. You wrong the Papiſts to right your ſelves. For they do not make their inherent Righteouſneſs part of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, but they aſcribe the merit of the *former* to the merit of the *latter*: or (to uſe their own words,) they ſay, *Chriſt hath merited that we ſhould merit:* Or that *our works merit being dipped in the blood of Chriſt.*

2. Whereas you ſay, *You do not take works to be the ſmalleſt portion of our Legal Righteouſneſs*: It cannot ſink into my head, that you can mean as you ſay, becauſe you aſſign the ſame end to *your* Works, which *Chriſt* aimed at in *his*; I mean, *our juſtification.* We indeed truly affirm, that *our Works* are not the ſmalleſt portion of our *Legal Righteouſneſs*; becauſe we do them not for the ſame end, that Chriſt did his (*viz.*) for our Juſtification, but for the Glory of God's Soveraignty, which is not depreſſed by the exaltation of Mercy.

3. You call your *Works only a part of our Evangelical Righteouſneſs.* Pray what is the other part?

Gal. Faith. Have you forgotten our late Diſcourſe?

Paul. No, no. But I thought fit to quicken your attention by the Queſtion,

to

to a paſſage of the Learned *Ball*, (whom your party unjuſtly claim) *How Faith and Works ſhould be conjoined, as con-cauſes in Juſtification is impoſſible to conceive*, [Treat. *Covenant of Grace*, p. 70.]

Gal. But he was miſtaken: Do not you remember what I told you lately, that *our Works are part of the condition upon which Chriſts Righteouſneſs ſhall be ours*, and *Faith* another part. And ſo they are *con-cauſes* or have the ſame cauſality (*viz.*) of a condition of Juſtification.

Paul. But this will not ſalve the difficulty. For then *Faith is not contra-diſtinguiſhed to Works*, but is only *one more eminent part* of the *Works* by which we are *juſtified*, and ſo Faith and Works are not *joynt*-Cauſes, but Works are the *Sole* cauſe [or *condition*] of our Juſtification. I conclude with a repetion of a paſſage of the Learned *Tully*, (which one that underſtands Latine hath tranſlated for me) concerning the Author of thoſe differences you have aſſigned between the Popiſh Doctrine and yours. *The Reverend* A. *endeavours indeed to clear his opinion from the ſuſpicion of that contagion* [*viz.* Popery] *but this he does ſo faintly, in ſo few words, and ſo curſorily, that any one may perceive he undertook a task no way greatful to himſelf*, [*Juſtif.* Paul. p. 116.] But now it is high time to proceed to another

nother grand Argument againſt your conditionality of works done by Grace. The *Firſt* was that no works are the condition of Juſtification therefore not Works done by Grace.

Arg. 2. The Second is, That if Works done by Grace are the condition [or matter] of Juſtification before God, then our Juſtification is not of Grace.

Gal. I ſhould think that the Conſequence ſhould be rather, that then our Juſtification is of Grace.

Paul. No ſuch matter; at leaſt, if you will credit a Divine of your own Denomination, who ſays; *By the Covenant of works the meer work gave an intereſt in the reward, as it was obedience to the precept, by a Sanction that had goodneſs, but no ſuch Grace,* [*viz.* as that in the Covenant of Grace] It ſeems then, that in *his Opinion*, the *goodneſs* [or Grace] of God did not appear ſo eminently in the *Covenant of Works* wherein the promiſe was made to the meer Work, as it does, in the *Covenant of Grace.* And hence I infer, that therefore this *latter Covenant*, that it may anſwer its denomination, and be ſufficiently diſtinguiſhed from the *former*, muſt not have a *ſanction* [or promiſe of Juſtification and Salvation] made to the *meer Works.* i. e. *Obedience to the Precept*, which yet he and you aſſert in

in ſenſe, though not in the very terms mentioned. And one of your Party upon *Rom.* 3. 28, 29. compared, ſays, that we are Juſtified, *i. e.* accounted Righteous and dealt with accordingly: *By believing in Chriſt, which is our Goſpel Righteouſneſs, or the terms and conditions of the Covenant of Grace for Juſtification (as amongſt us ſome Felons are quited as to life by their Clergy, or upon their reading.)* And this Faith, he deſcribes, *ſuch a firm, hearty, lively belief of Chriſt to be what the Goſpel declares him to be, as begets ſincere obedience in the life.* It is plain, that this Authour makes Faith in Chriſt ſuch a condition, as *reading* to the Felons acquittal. And ſure *this* a *meer Work* required by the *Law* by vertue whereof his life is ſaved. And he makes that Faith to be a *Dogmatical Faith*; which is a *meer work*, and cannot be otherwiſe conſidered, then as ſuch. Let us frame a definition of the Faith required in the Covenant of Works, according to this Authors Notion. It was ſuch a firm, hearty, lively belief of *God* to be, what the *Light of Nature* declared him to be, as begat *perfect Obedience* in the life. And then, I think he is quick ſighted, that can diſcern a difference between the *one* Faith and the *other* in their reſpect to the Sanctions. For both are *meer* works, and as ſuch, give intereſt in the reward promiſed. *Gal.*

Gal. But the reward is not to the *meer Work* in the Covenant of Grace, becauſe 'tis but *Sincerity* (which is conſiſtent with *Sin*,) that is the condition of the reward.

Paul. The ſame *Authour* upon *Rom.* 3. 27. interprets the *Law of works to be that Law which requires perfect Obedience for Juſtification, and the Law of Faith, that Goſpel Law, which ſets up Faith in the room of Law-works for Juſtification*, ſo that then, whether the work were *perfect* or *ſincere Juſtification* is the reward promiſed to both; to the *former*, as a *meer Old Law-work*, to the *latter*, as a *meer New Law-work*.

Gal. But the aforeſaid Author ſays, on *Rom.* 3. 9. All being guilty of Sin, are equally excluded from poſſibility of being juſtified by Works.

Paul. But all New Law-Workers are guilty of Sin, *Ergo*, they are equally excluded from a poſſibility of being Juſtified by Works.

Gal. But you omit what the Authour adds in the ſame verſe. *And therefore the Goſpel-righteouſneſs is no leſs neceſſary for the one* [the Jews] *than the other* [the Gentiles.]

Paul. Well minded. *Neceſſary* for what? To reconcile contradictions; that they who being Sinners cannot be Juſtified by any Works, ſhould be juſtified by *ſome* [*viz.* New Law-Works.]

Gal.

Gal. But how do you prove your Conſequence, that if Works of Grace be the condition of Juſtification? then Juſtification is not of Grace.

Paul. Becauſe thoſe Works give occaſion of boaſting, ſo *Rom.* 3. 27. Hence the Apoſtle Argues, *chap.* 4. 2. which runs thus. If *Abraham* were juſtified by Works, he hath whereof to Glory [*viz. before God*] But he hath not whereof to glory before God; therefore *Abraham* was not juſtified by Works. [So *Calv. Par.* and others.]

Gal. But theſe Works are ſuch as were done without ſpecial grace, or perfect, *&c.*

Paul. Enough hath been ſaid to confute that pretence.

Gal. But *Faith* is the Work of God, and ſo takes away boaſting of our own Abilities, and Righteouſneſs.

Paul. As though Works done by common grace, or perfect works, were not the Works of God too; and upon the ſame ground exclude Boaſting in *our own Abilities*,

2. As to *Righteouſneſs*, if *Faith* be ſuch, either it gives ground of boaſting (and ſo is excluded from Juſtification) or if it do'nt, then the Apoſtle gives a caution where there is no danger. I ſhall only add, that the Apoſtles deſign is, to prove, that we are *Juſtified* by *Grace*, and ſo all precence of *boaſting* is excluded, *Becauſe we are not Juſtified by any Righteouſneſs in us from Chriſt, but by a Righteouſneſs in Chriſt for us.* And ſo we proceed to,

Arg. 3. If we are juſtified by Righteouſneſs of Chriſt imputed, then we are not juſtified by our inherent Righteouſneſs: But the *former* is true, and therefore the *latter*. That Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is imputed appears by *Rom.* 4. 11. compared with 2 *Cor.* 5. *ult.*

Gal. But what do you mean by the term *Imputation* in this Queſtion?

Paul.

Paul. It is an Act of God aſcribing to us the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, and accounting it ours no leſs, than if we had in our own Perſons performed it, [ſo Dr. *W. Slater* on *Rom.* 4. 6. p. 52. and generally our Divines to the ſame ſenſe if their words be ſomewhat different] And the Foundation of this *Act of Gods*, they make *Chriſt's ſuretyſhip*, mentioned, *Heb.* 7. 22.

Gal. This Opinion ſeemeth to aſcribe to God a miſtaking *Judgment*, as to eſteem us to have done in Chriſt what we did not.

Paul. There's no more ground to ſuppoſe a miſtake in God, than in the Creditor, that he ſhould reckon his debt paid by the Debtor, when he knew it was paid by the Surety. But as the payment of the debt by the ſurety is in the eye of the Law the Debtor's Act. So is the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt performed by him in our ſtead, by legal reputation, is our act and deed, and is available to us, as if had been perſonal.

Gal. Then we are as Righteous as Chriſt.

Paul. 1. Some of our Divines deny the conſequence, and think it no better than this, *The Debtor is as rich as his Surety, becauſe the Surety hath paid his Debt* [*Clarkſon* Sermon a Morning Lecture againſt Popery, *pag.* 455.] And they give this Reaſon, *Becauſe the Righteouſneſs of chriſt is not imputed to any particular believer according to the whole latitude of it, but as he needs it,* [*Dav.* Juſt. Hab. p. 331.]

2. Some Divines grant the conſequence, with limitation. A Learned Man in a Sermon juſt now publiſhed: ſays, *As Chriſt is perfectly Righteous having fully paid the Debt, and being fully diſcharged, ſo are they in him.* And he adds for illuſtration and proof, *The Original Debtor is as clear and free as his ſurety is, conſidered as his ſurety, when the debt is paid, and that payment accepted for, and adjudged to the Original Debtor, by the Creditor.* [Mr. *Nath. Mather.*

Mather. Ser. *Righteouſneſs of God*, p. 24, 25.] And I ſee not what exception can be made againſt the grant, thus bounded.

Gal. But you have forgot to prove your conſequence.

Paul. No, no. That is proved thus, he that hath a Righteouſneſs of his own, needs not another's for Juſtification. And he that is Juſtified by anothers Righteouſneſs, muſt needs be ſuppoſed to be deſtitute of any Righteouſneſs of his own. And thus much is imported in that notable Scripture, *Phil.* 3. 8, 9. which all *Old Proteſtant Divines* were wont to *urge* againſt the *Papiſts*. The great *Calvin* obſerves on this place, that the *Apoſtles compares two Righteouſneſſes together, Man's own, and Gods, as contraries which cannot ſtand together* —— *For whereas the, Law brings Works, Faith offers a naked Man to God, that he may be clothed with the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt.*

Gal. Some of our Divines underſtand the Righteouſneſs here oppoſed to be *Pauls* Jewiſh and Evangelical Righteouſneſs.

Paul. 1. Then there's no *Oppoſition* at all, nor between the *Righteouſneſſes*, for neither of them are a Righteouſneſs: not the *former* for that is defective in *parts*, [external Righteouſneſs without internal,] not the *latter*, for that is defective in *degrees* [by the Apoſtles acknowledgment, *ver.* 12. *Not as though I were already perfect*] nor between the *Apoſtles intereſt* in them. If the words *my own* refer to the *Author*, neither of the Righteouſneſſes were *his own*, both *Gods*. If to the *Subject and Agent*, then *both* were *his own*. [ſee *Acts.* 15. 9. 1 *Joh.* 3 3] And it cannot ſink into my head, that the Apoſtle could not ſpeak ſenſe.

2. Suppoſing the Law of Oppoſition obſerved: Why does the Apoſtle renounce his own *Pharaſaical Righteouſneſs?*

Gal.

Gal. Becauſe it would not be *gain* to him. *i. e.* advantageous to him to procure acceptance with God.

Paul. Then it ſeems he relied upon his *own Goſpel Righteouſneſs* for that end, which could not be obtained by his *other Righteouſneſs.* But I have always thought, that God hath made us accepted in the beloved, *Eph.* 1. 6. *i. e.* that Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, [*viz.* whereof himſelf is the *Subject* and *Agent*] had been the procuring cauſe of our acceptance with God.

Gal. But a late Author urges many Arguments to confirm his interpretation.

Paul. I am not ignorant of them, but what you have heard now will give you an intimation what Anſwer may be returned. My occaſions call me away, you and I may have perhaps an opportunity to diſcourſe further of theſe Points, and others wherein your Party ſtand at a great diſtance from ours. In the mean while, as to the main point we have been upon, I would have you conſider, that all the *Proteſtant Arguments*, though they are directed againſt the *merit* of Works aſſerted by the *Papiſts*, yet they exclude the *Conditionality* of them too; becauſe they make Faith the only medium or inſtrument of applying Chriſts Righteouſneſs, as the meer Act of the eye, was the only means of cure to the *Iſraelites* bitten by fiery Serpents, *John* 3 14. 15.

Gal. This parting word ſticks. I believe I ſhall ſhortly be a *Deſerter.*

Paul. The ſooner the better.

FINIS.